

CORRIGENDUM.

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS.

27th March 1922.

Page 3614, *after* Grant XXIX—Superannuation allowances and Pension, and *before* Grant XXXI Stationery and Printing (Transferred) *read—*

Grant XXX Stationery and Printing (Reserved)

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 3,89,936 under Stationery and Printing Reserved — Provincial — Voted charges. The reasons are those stated in the estimates furnished to the Council."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Monday the 27th day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.O.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner :—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions, and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

Sub-overseers in the Public Works Department.

1390 Q.—Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Public Works be pleased to state—

(1) how many sub-overseers are going to have their services dispensed with in the Public Works Department and how many were given notice in the Second Circle;

(2) whether the reduction is intended for effecting retrenchment or to serve any other purpose;

(3) in either case what is the necessity for appointing additional overseers to fill their places, seeing that the replacement of two sub-overseers by one overseer results in an extra expenditure of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent;

(4) what is the increase of establishment sanctioned to the Public Works Department during the past five years in numbers and extra cost incurred;

(5) what is the total amount of expenditure incurred by raising the salaries of provincial gazetted and subordinate officers of the Public Works Department; and

(6) what is the amount given to them in lump sums by giving retrospective effect to the revision of salaries?

A.—(1) The services of 51 sub-overseers are proposed to be dispensed with in the Public Works Department.

In the Second Circle, the Superintending Engineer has served notices of discharge on 58 permanent sub-overseers. Only about 21 permanent posts are to be abolished and the matter is under separate inquiry.

(2) & (3) The reduction is intended only for effecting retrenchment of expenditure. Two of the sections in the Kistna Eastern division now held by sub-overseers are to be placed in charge of upper subordinates from 1st April 1922 as their jurisdictions are to be enlarged by reducing the total number of sections.

[27th March 1922]

(4)

Engineer Establishment.

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost.
1916-17	Nil. 18 (from 165 to 183)	Nil. The increase is the result of the introduction of the new Madras
1917-18		
1918-19		
1919-20		
1920-21		

Engineering Service (in place of the Sub-Engineer establishment) to provide for the bulk of the permanent subdivisional officers. The extra cost on account of the increased number of appointments and on account of the introduction of the new service is given in the answer to (5) below.

Specialist Establishment (Architects and Electrical Engineers).

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost per annum.
1916-17	Nil.	Rs. Nil.
1917-18	Nil.	Nil.
1918-19	1 (Architect) from 2 to 3	4,800
1919-20	Nil.	Nil.
1920-21	1 (Architect) from 3 to 4 1 (Electrical Engineer) from 2 to 3	17,400

NOTE.—The number of Architects has since been reduced by 1, i.e., from 4 to 3.

Permanent Upper Subordinate Establishment.

No increase in the past five years. On the other hand there has been a decrease in number consequent on the formation of the new Madras Engineering Service.

Temporary Upper Subordinate Establishment.

Year.	Increase in number.	Extra cost per annum.
1916-17	No increase but decrease by 41 (from 173 to 132).	Rs. Nil.
1917-18	21 (from 132 to 153) ..	15,120
1918-19	1 (from 153 to 154) ..	720
1919-20	46 (from 154 to 200) ..	33,120
1920-21	12 (from 200 to 212) ..	8,640

NOTE.—The number for 1922-23 is to be reduced to 167.

27th March 1922]

Lower Subordinate, Clerical and Menial Establishments.

The information is not readily available.

- (5) The extra expenditure per annum on account of the promotion of sub-engineers and supervisors to the new Madras Engineering Service is about Rs. 3,05,000. But the *ultimate extra cost* on account of the introduction of the Madras Engineering Service will be reduced to about Rs. 1 lakh per annum by a reduction of numbers in the Indian Service of Engineers. Information in regard to the clerical and menial establishments is not readily available. The revision of pay of lower subordinates has not yet been given effect to.
- (6) The amount given in lump sums to the men appointed to the Madras Engineering Service by giving retrospective effect to their promotions is about Rs. 4,40,000. Retrospective effect was not given to the revision of the scales of pay of clerical and menial establishments.

Village service establishment.

1391 Q.—Rao Sahib S. ELLAPPA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the income from the enfranchisement of village service inams in the proprietary estates of the Presidency ; and

(b) how much do the Government contribute as their share towards the pay of the village service establishments of the proprietary estates ?

A.—The Member is referred to the Civil Budget Estimate for 1922-23 which contains the information.

Travelling allowance of vaccinators.

1392 Q.—MR. A. P. I. SAIYID IBRAHIM RAVUTTAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Government have increased the travelling allowance of the vaccinators ?

A.—The answer is in the negative.

G.O. No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921, containing the most recent orders on the subject of the travelling allowance of vaccinators under local boards is laid on the table.*

No travelling allowance is ordinarily payable to municipal vaccinators.

Record-of-rights and settlement of rent in Kallikota and Atagada estates.

1393 Q.—SRIMAN SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Kallikota-Atagada estates in the Ganjam district were surveyed in 1912 with the promise that the record-of-rights and settlement of rents would be effected on the conclusion of the survey ;

[27th March 1922]

(b) whether on the conclusion of the said survey the ryots of these two estates were asked to deposit money for the said record-of-rights and settlement of rents;

(c) whether it is a fact that most of the villages in these two estates have deposited the necessary money;

(d) if so, what is the delay in effecting the necessary record-of-rights and the settlement of rents due to; and

(e) with reference to the recent representation of the ryots' association of these estates to the Commissioner of Land Revenue, what steps have been taken to expedite settlement operations and when the said operations are likely to commence?

A.—(a) A survey of the Kallikota-Atagada estates was ordered in 1912. The Government did not give any promise that a record-of-rights and settlement of rents would be effected on the conclusion of the survey.

(b), (c), (d) & (e) The Government have no information, but will call for a report.

APPENDIX.

[Vide answer to question No. 1392 asked by Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 27th March 1922, page 3583 supra.]

G.O. No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921.

Read—the following papers:—

Memorandum No. 2223-1, Medical, dated 12th July 1920.

File of replies to Memorandum No. 2223-1, Medical, dated 12th July 1920.

Order—No. 1630, P.H., dated 2nd December 1921.

The Government approve the action of the Madura District Board in having raised the fixed travelling allowance of vaccinators employed under local boards from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 a month and recommend the higher rate to other local boards for adoption. The Government would also advise all local boards to consider whether it would not be desirable in the interests of efficiency to pay them according to the rates given in the Civil Service Regulations.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

B. RAMA RAO,
Under Secretary to Government in charge.

To Presidents of all District Boards, except Malabar.
 „ Presidents of all Taluk Boards (through Presidents of District Boards).
 „ the Surgeon-General.
 „ the Sanitary Commissioner.
 „ the Accountant-General.
 „ the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.

Copy to the President of the Malabar District Board.

27th March 1922]

II

ACT ASSENTED TO BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have to inform the House that the Bill to amend the Madras City Municipal Act, 1919, which was passed at the meeting held on the 14th March 1922, received the assent of His Excellency the Governor on the 24th March 1922."

III

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I have to inform the House that as a result of the ballot held on Saturday, the 25th March 1922, for the election of seven members of the Public Accounts Committee, the following members have been duly elected :—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
Rao Bahadur P. C. Etrajulu Nayudu.
Mr. P. T. Rajan.
Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.

Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib.
Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.
Mr. M. R. Seturatham Ayyar."

IV

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"With reference to the Finance Committee, the nominations to which were received on Saturday, I have to inform the House that up to 6 p.m. on that day 19 hon. Members had been duly nominated. The election of six members out of these 19 to serve on the Finance Committee for next year will be held at 1-30 p.m. to-day in the Council Chamber, the Secretary being the returning officer as usual."

V

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND XXIX.—PENSIONS.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 42.93 lakhs under Demand XXIX—Pensions. This is a demand, Sir, with respect to which no amendments have been received, and I think you, Sir, like the presiding Judge at a Sessions when there are no criminals, are entitled to the presentation of a pair of white gloves."

The demand was put to the House and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXX.—STATIONERY AND PRINTING (RESERVED).

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 26.12 lakhs for Stationery (for reserved departments) and Printing."

Motion 752.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

752. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,60,000, for expenditure in England, by Rs. 100.*

Motion 753.

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to move—

753. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,60,000 for expenditure in England.*

[Mr. A. Subbarayudu]

[27th March 1922]

"This amount is shown in the budget for purchase of stationery and also for replacing the stores in the press. The revised estimate for 1921-22 was 23 lakhs and odd, while in the present budget a provision of 28 lakhs and odd is made. That shows an additional amount of five lakhs of rupees. Now, Sir, the price of paper at present is 50 per cent less than what it was in the past, and as such it is difficult to understand how the additional sum of five lakhs of rupees is going to be spent. The present market price of paper is £20 to £40 according to varieties, while the price last year was £100 to £150 per ton. From the report of the hon. the Finance Member, I see that economy is being effected in all directions, and also a special director of office systems has been appointed for finding out economies. In these circumstances also, the provision ought to have been much less. I understand that recently a committee has been appointed for finding out the stationery expenditure, and I also learn that forms are abundantly printed which will be available for another ten years. As such, there must naturally be some reduction for the coming year. Besides, hon. Members are aware that the Imperial budget for the year 1921-22 amounted to 98 lakhs of rupees, while they have this year reduced it to 67 lakhs. That shows a 30 per cent reduction, while our expenditure is 22½ per cent more. This amount of eight lakhs is provided for the purchase of stationery in England; and I

11-15 a.m. do not see necessity of purchasing stationery in England while you have provided in the budget Rs. 11,50,000 for the purchase of stationery from the central stores. The purchase made during the current year from the central stores is Rs. 14,73,000 whereas your estimate for this year is Rs. 11,50,000. A reduction of Rs. 3,20,000 is naturally due to the reduction in the price of paper and not in the quantity. So, where is the necessity for you to estimate another eight lakhs of rupees for purchase in England. If you want to purchase for eight lakhs from England then, naturally, you must deduct that amount from the purchase in the central stores. You have not done so. While the expenditure for the last two years was ranging to 23 lakhs, this year you are charging 23 lakhs. Naturally the prices are cheaper now. More economy is being observed. But if the amount goes higher than the previous year it is inexplicable, unless it be that you are going to make some purchases for the coming years also. I also see that you are spending Rs. 50,000 as a separate item from the ordinary head of contingencies, viz., Rs. 8,000 for charcoal, Rs. 4,000 for miscellaneous and Rs. 30,000 for contingencies, and indents for stores Rs. 15,776. You have already budgeted for these items, and where is the necessity for another allotment of Rs. 57,000 for the purchase of press materials. It is very regrettable that whereas a number of paper mills here are supplying to the merchants in India, the Government of India is not able to make the purchases from the paper mills in India. I am doubtful whether the paper got from England is cheaper than the paper of the Indian mills. No doubt the Indian paper mills are able to supply only a cheaper variety. But those varieties will certainly beat down the imported goods in the matter of cost. I therefore see that is no there necessity for your extra expenditure of Rs. 8,60,000 from the central stores. I, therefore, make this motion."

Mr. T. E. MOIR:—"The hon. Member who made this motion has requested an explanation of the apparent large increase in the proposed expenditure on stationery in the coming year. I have attempted to explain the situation in the budget memorandum. I admit that the figures are not

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

in themselves very clear or explicit, but I followed the old custom under which this expenditure is exhibited. But I hope that from next year we shall be able to effect some improvements in the manner in which these statements are presented by making a clean separation between 'stationery' and 'printing' which, I think, will help to make matters clearer to the members of the Council.

"The real explanation of this apparent increase is that it is due to a new arrangement in connexion with the stationery stores in Madras. As has been explained in the memorandum, hitherto these stores known as the 'central stores' were financed entirely by the Government of India and our position was this: that all articles indented for on behalf of the stores were paid for in the first instance by the Government of India and we merely paid them for what we actually consumed by an annual adjustment. Then the question of future arrangements arose in connexion with the reforms and after considerable correspondence on the subject the Government of India in October last informed us that they had decided to abolish the present central stores and that we must in future finance our own stationery. They did not, of course, propose to remove their property from the stores to Madras as that would have been an absurd and wasteful arrangement. But they said 'you shall take over the contents of the existing stores at the close of the year 1921-22 and shall repay us for the value of the stores on hand at that date by annual instalments of five lakhs.' They also requested us to agree in future to supply certain imperial officers whom it would be difficult for them to supply from Calcutta and to agree that they should be allowed to continue to draw from the stores which will now be our stores on payment of the cost of articles drawn therefrom plus a certain charge for our services in running the stores. Thus what we have now to do is not only to pay for all future purchases of stores but also to repay the Government of India for the balance of stores in stock. In fact our position is like that of a merchant who has been carrying on a business on a standing overdraft with his bankers who is suddenly told that he will no longer be allowed an overdraft and that he will have to repay his overdraft in annual instalments. We are in exactly the same position. The apparent excess of 4.84 lakhs over the expenditure of 1921-22 is accounted for by the fact that we are now not only making our annual purchases but that until we have paid the Government of India for the stocks in store we shall have an increased expenditure on that count until we have wholly repaid it. Under the agreement that extra payment amounts in the coming year to 5 lakhs. Now, as regards our reserve stock which was maintained by the Government of India, we have hitherto had no anxiety. We paid in cash for what we bought and reasonable requests for additional stocks were met without any question. The rule regarding the reserve was that in respect of articles procured from Europe we should have a year's stock in reserve and in the case of country articles that we should maintain a six months' stock in reserve. A reserve of that kind is obviously very essential when you are dealing with stores to the value of 20 or more lakhs because unless you have a sufficient reserve, especially at the present time, you are going to be entirely at the mercy of the market, and as a matter of fact during the last two or three years we have several times been caught at a disadvantage owing to our having to purchase our supplies in a hurry and thereby being at the mercy of those from whom we purchased them. It may be useful to the Council if I state the position with regard to our stores. The figures given on page 71 of the memorandum

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[27th March 1922]

will show you that in 1920-21 our actual expenditure on stationery amounted to 15.72 lakhs. That of course was considerably in excess of what we had hitherto been accustomed to. The House is aware that there was a very large expenditure in connexion with the introduction of the reforms and with the elections which were necessary to set them going. For 1921-22 in spite of the warning of the previous year we reduced our budget estimate to 10.26 lakhs, but this optimistic anticipation has been entirely falsified. You will see from the same memorandum that the revised estimate for the current year at a time when the budget was prepared several months ago was 14.73 lakhs. We have received later information since then and the estimated expenditure during the current year is 16.19 lakhs or an increase of about Rs. 40,000 over the actual expenditure for the previous year.

11-30 a.m. "This excess expenditure means of course a further reduction in the balance of stock in hand. The actual estimate of consumption of the Stationery Department for 1922-23 when the original budget was put in was $14\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs; but in its enthusiasm for economy the Finance Department cut it down to the figure which the hon. Member has referred to, viz., $11\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs. If we can get down to that extent the Finance Department will be extremely pleased. But I am afraid we shall go far beyond that amount next year. The most we can possibly hope for is to reduce the expenditure to 15 lakhs. Now you see from the figures that the provision we have made for expenditure in the coming year is 16 lakhs, including 8 lakhs in India and 8 lakhs in England. With a balance of 7 lakhs you will have a total supply of 23 lakhs worth of paper and stationery. Now if we were to maintain the old rule—the salutary rule—laid down by the Government of India that, to avoid placing ourselves at the mercy of the market, we should have a reserve stock of one year's supply of articles procured from England and a six months' reserve of articles supplied here, we ought to have a reserve of 11 lakhs; whereas our actual figure will only give us a reserve of 8 lakhs, that is to say, 3 lakhs less than the figure which the Government of India insists upon as a measure. I think it would be inadvisable to run any risk especially in the present fluctuating condition of the paper market by placing ourselves to a larger extent at the mercy of the producers. We have not thought it possible therefore to reduce the reserve which we ought to have to a greater extent than 3 lakhs.

"As regards expenditure in England, I may say that it is at present merely a nominal figure. We have not yet committed ourselves to the actual expenditure in England except for certain articles which are immediately required and which we knew were either obtainable only in England or under existing circumstances could be supplied thence at a lower price. At present we have not committed ourselves in view of the existing circumstances to actual purchase either in India or in England and although the entry of 8 lakhs was based on our information that certain articles and certain kinds of paper could be supplied more cheaply there owing to increased production than they could be supplied from the mills here, we have not committed ourselves to that course. What we propose to do is to instruct the Superintendent of Stationery to watch the market carefully, so that he may gain the advantage of any change in prices either in India or in England. I trust, therefore, that with this assurance the House will accept the estimate. I hope I have explained to the hon. Member the increase of 5 lakhs to which he referred.

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

"I propose now while dealing with the general question of stationery expenditure, to explain why the estimate covers two demands, one demand which will be moved under the reserved head and the other which will be moved under the transferred head. That is simply an attempt to show against the reserved and transferred subjects their proportionate share of expenditure. Naturally the expenditure is much larger at present under the reserved departments; because they include more stationery consuming departments such as the 'land revenue' and 'administration of justice.' But in case of any misapprehension I may state that that apportioning of expenditure between the reserved and transferred departments is purely formal. I will ask the House not to suppose that the expenditure which is required on transferred subjects will be refused. The hon. Member himself has explained that it is really a joint-stock and each department has its actual requirements to meet as they arise.

"As regards future expenditure, it is very difficult to hold out any hope that it will be possible to reduce it. We do hope to be able to check the increase in expenditure. But we have to meet so many new demands on our stationery. Take for example a department which was referred to the other day, the Department of Agriculture. There was a demand from several parts of the House that the Agricultural Department should do much more to disseminate knowledge among the people. The only way in which we can do this is by the circulation of pamphlets and notes on a large scale; and I am sure the House would greatly regret if any reduction of expenditure under this head and a consequent reduction in the dissemination of knowledge of that kind were made. I may say that no object can be gained by under-estimating our possible expenditure under stationery. If we do under-estimate it and have to go to the House for supplementary grants, it merely means, as I have already pointed out, that we shall have to go to the Government of India and we may have great difficulty in getting the Government of India to meet our needs full. On consideration of the whole subject, the Finance Department and the Government have come to the conclusion that this is an essential demand and I hope that the House will accept it."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"I am not at all convinced by the arguments of the Finance Secretary. It will be a simple rule of three for the hon. Members to find out the solution. The consumption is less; the prices are less; but the expenditure is more. I understand that the hon. the Finance Secretary tells us that he is purchasing this 8 lakhs worth of paper from the central reserve. I want to know in simple words how he explains the extra quantity or the extra amount."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I reply, Sir? I shall be very glad to give the hon. Member the explanation in a few simple sentences. I fully recognize that the account is extremely difficult to understand for reasons which Mr. Moir has explained. He has explained the figures in detail. Now let me try to explain the entries, as the hon. Member says, in a few words—in simple sentences.

"In the first place we have got to maintain a reserve of stationery. We never had a reserve before. We have now got to pay for a reserve. That is new expenditure for this year and expenditure resulting from the reforms.

"In the second place, when we issue stationery from the store we show a debit in the accounts of the amount that was paid for it when we purchased

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

it. If we issue stationery to-day, we do not pay the price of to-day, but we pay the price which existed, say, four years ago, when paper was very dear. These are the two main items which account for the increase.

"There remains the question that we do not buy in India. The answer to that is that at the time when we wanted to purchase, the prices in India were much higher than the prices in England.

"Lastly, as regards the quantity, we have made many economies, but we have to set against them items in connexion with which there has been an increase in the expenditure, for instance, expenditure for purposes of this Council. But again the increase shown in the books is not really an increase in the quantity but an increase in prices. The price of paper has increased enormously and for the same sum of money we get much less paper than we did in the days before the war.

"This is then the explanation in a few words: institution of a reserve; increase in prices; and the fact that we show our expenditure for the year at the price at which the paper was bought."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Now I find that the Government is purchasing the stores of the Central Government at a higher rate. What is the necessity for the Madras Government to purchase the stores of the Central Government purchased long ago at higher prices?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The Madras Government is subordinate to the Government of India and the Government of India have issued instructions to us to pay and we have to obey."

Mr. A. SUBBARAYUDU :—"Why should not other Provincial Governments do so?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The arrangement is not one peculiar to the Madras Government but is one that extends to all Governments that have stationery stores."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 754.

11-45 a.m. Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

754. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs for stationery by 5 lakhs.*

"Sir, I have tabled this motion with two objects in view. One of them is to reduce the expenditure on stationery. The Government have been trying its level best, as it says, to reduce the cost of stationery. It has been using the same envelopes over and over again in despatching letters and it is trying to effect retrenchment in stationery and in other ways. But it seems to me there is still much waste of stationery in the Government departments. There is unnecessary record of statistics that swell its reports. I am specially referring to the hydro-electric survey reports for example. It is a very beautifully bound book with a beautiful map of India and with so many plates, but the work done is incommensurate with the report circulated."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, the report of the hydro-electric surveys is a Government of India publication and the cost of printing it is borne by the Government of India. We have nothing to do with it."

27th March 1922]

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"I said that as one of the samples of reports. I think it can very well be reduced in size and statistics. I also find our very Legislative Council not to be setting a very good example in the matter of stationery. We sometimes receive the same thing over and over again, first typed and then printed and so on. I think we can keep in mind the Scottish proverb: 'many a mickle makes a muckle' in the matter of stationery. We are tempted to waste stationery as if they are worth nothing. Their accumulated cost seems to be very heavy.

"My other idea in tabling this resolution is a little carefulness in stationery will result in less red tape. As one of the hon. Members remarked, if this Government ever sinks at all, it will be sinking in its load of papers and records and stationery and red tapism. As I said before, for quick despatch of work there must be less of stationery. I have often seen clerks sitting in the same room, if they want to consult one another, they pass paper from one to the other and then accumulate the file. What can be easily done by verbal exchange of thought is done on paper with the result that paper is much wasted and also much time is wasted."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, it has been rather difficult to hear the hon. Member from this side of the House, but I think the main gist of his statement is there are still items in which considerable economies can be effected in the use of stationery. Now I have no doubt that there are still such items and we have not yet got to the end of our search for economies. May I assure the hon. Member that, during the past year, there has been discussion on these matters again and again. If he wishes I could give him, though not now, a complete statement of all the ways, large and small, in which we have attempted to enforce economy. I can assure the hon. Member that investigations and further measures of economy will be continued during the coming year. But after all there is a limit to which you can effect economies in such ways and I do not anticipate that we should be able to effect such further economies by such measures as would in any way justify our consenting to a reduction in the present estimate. I may say that the expenditure on stationery in this Presidency, if you consider that it covers the administration of a population well over 40 millions, would not to a western eye seem a very heavy item. As an instance of our economical ways I might possibly cite the papers which are put before this very Council. No one can say that it is an expensive paper. There are probably few legislative councils in the world in which their proceedings and the matter placed before them are put up in such cheap form. If we went in for still cheaper paper we should soon arrive at a paper on which you could not write or print on more than one side. I can assure the hon. Member that the question of further economies has not been lost sight of and we shall attempt to effect further savings by every possible means."

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—"We should effect economy not only in the matter of quality but also in the matter of quantity. I have no idea of pressing this resolution. If the Government is a little more careful, they can effect greater economies."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Before the resolution is withdrawn, I should like with your permission, Sir, to indicate one direction in which economy is possible. It is a direction which concerns this Council. I have been at pains to total up the questions and resolutions since the reformed

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[27th March 1922]

Council came into being in January last year. I find that the questions answered during that period number 1,949, that there were 421 resolutions on matters of general public interest and that budget motions to the number of 1,474 have been tabled. Further the proceedings of the Council, which are put in our hands in those admirable booklets by the Secretary aggregate to 4,164 pages up to the 4th March 1922. I have no doubt that a total of 5,000 pages will be easily exceeded before the proceedings of the last three weeks have been put in print. I mention these figures because hon. Members do not quite realize what a terrible volume of work the reformed Council has brought about. Every one of these pages, it would probably be no exaggeration to say, means many other pages in the lower stages of the official hierarchy. The preparation of answers to these questions and also to the questions which are sent in but do not reach the stage of being answered, the preparation of replies to resolutions, whether they are moved or not moved, has cast a very heavy burden on the administrative machinery. During the past three weeks it has been a matter of extreme physical and mental strain to keep anything like pace with the current duties."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 755 to 757.

The following motions were not made :—

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

755. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

756. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

757. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 26.12 lakhs for stationery by Rs. 5 lakhs.*

Demand XXX—Stationery (for reserved departments) and Printing for Rs. 26.12 lakhs was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXI—STATIONERY AND PRINTING (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 2.07 lakhs under Demand XXXI—Stationery (for transferred departments)."

Motions 758 to 760.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANISACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

758. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2.07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

759. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2.07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

27th March 1922]

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

760. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2·07 lakhs for stationery and printing by Rs. 100.*

Demand XXXI—Stationery (for reserved departments) for Rs 2·07 lakhs was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXII—RESERVE WITH THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 6·00 lakhs under Demand XXXII—Reserve with the Finance Department.”

Motions 761 to 765.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

761. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

762. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

763. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

764. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

765. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

Motion 766.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

766. *To reduce the allotment of 6 lakhs for the reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by 5 lakhs.*

“ Sir, I want to know whether it is necessary to have such a large reserve in the financial budget itself. We have been told that this amount is kept for emergency purposes. However, such a large reserve seems to be open to objection. The House would see that whenever the Government want to spend more money they come to us for the necessary sanction. Whereas if they have such a large reserve, they would be spending it to the last pie and come to us only after the whole amount is spent. In any case I want to have some more light thrown upon the matter by the hon. the Finance Member.”

[27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, while I quite agree that this demand for a grant requires some explanation, I think I shall

12 noon.

be able to satisfy the hon. Member that under the peculiar circumstances of the present year it is a necessary demand. The circumstances of the country this year are altogether peculiar. The Council have made large reductions in the budget amounting to something like eleven lakhs up to date, and in several instances, after attempting in vain to make specific reductions, they have made drastic cuts out of total allotments. Hon. Members in preparing these cuts have stated that, if the Government find any difficulty in the course of the year, they can apply to the House for supplementary grants, and the House will help them out of their difficulties. I would deprecate such a method of finance in any year, but in the present year would point out that it would be a practically impossible arrangement. In an ordinary year we should have balances to draw upon and normal revenues exceeding our expenditure, and if anything unforeseen happened we should be able to meet it out of our own funds subject to the Council voting the money. In the current year our revenue is not equal to our expenditure, and we have to borrow. In these circumstances it is extremely doubtful whether, even if the Government of India gives permission for an overdraft, we shall be in a position to meet any unexpected situation. The Council has asked us to put up a further demand of 22 lakhs for village officers, which will make up our deficit to 50 lakhs. What their action on the budget involves is this. If we find ourselves in difficulties owing to the drastic cuts, we shall have to come forward from time to time throughout the year with continuous requests for supplementary grants. If we have nothing in the budget to meet the supplementary grants we shall have to go to the Government of India to give us small additional loans. Now I venture to think that that would place us and the Government of India in a position of very great embarrassment. If the Council made these cuts with the prospect of our having to ask for supplementary grants, then it should make some provision out of which these supplementary grants could be given. If this position is granted, the question arises when the provision so made is to find place in the budget. We cannot draw the money in advance and call it balance, and the only other head it is possible to put it under is reserve.

" My hon. Friend seems to be under the impression that this reserve of six lakhs is so much pocket money which the Finance Department can use as it likes. I hope that he will disabuse his mind of that idea. The Finance Department has no such power. It can only transfer funds within a grant and he will see that there are no other items in this grant to which this money could be transferred. We hope to secure from the Government of India permission to draw up to six lakhs if urgent necessities make it imperative to move for supplementary grants in the course of the year. But we shall certainly not think of doing so without the sanction of the Council when that is required before we incur expenditure on any item. As to the question whether we are likely to have to come to the Council for supplementary grants, I would ask the Council to look into the list of supplementary grants asked for for 1921-22. I would ask them to consider how it would have been impossible to anticipate in this year such things as the rebellion in Malabar or the troubles in Guntur. I hope we shall not have to meet any such thing this year; but we must anticipate some possibilities. If I may mention one or two, there is the danger of an epidemic in any of our over-crowded jails, which would involve expenditure

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

in moving a large number of prisoners, the possibility of shortage of grains in the devastated areas in Malabar which we may have to meet at least by purchase and resale. There are other measures which we may have to take for the relief of sufferers in the rebellion or for the control of persons that have taken part in it. I think these circumstances will be enough to satisfy the Council of the necessity to make such a provision which could be drawn upon in the absence of a favourable balance. My real fear is that the provision for a reserve in the current budget is far too small to meet the demands that are certain to raise. Even if the Council passes this six lakhs we are likely to have to come to them for a further amount."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I do not know whether to accept the explanation as satisfactory or not. The hon. the Finance Member has told us that this provision has been made in view of the special circumstances of the year. One of the special circumstances seems to have been his prophetic vision of the cuts that this Council would make in the grants asked for. It makes me wonder whether the possibility of these reductions was taken into consideration when these figures —."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I say that when I spoke on the special circumstances of the year, what I had in mind was the absence of any balances from which we could draw."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—"I quite accept the assurance. I am also convinced of the special circumstances that he drew our attention to. I only hope, as he mentioned the cuts made by this House, that that idea will not be allowed to influence the budgets of the future. I agree that in the absence of a favourable balance we should have some reserve with the Finance Department. My only fear was that the reserve would be something like a pocket money to the Government. As the hon. the Finance Member has given us the assurance that before incurring additional expenditure he will come to this House for sanction, I beg leave to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 767 to 769.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

767. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,00,000 for reserve provision at the disposal of the Government by Rs. 5,00,000.*

Mr. A. T. PALMER :—

768. *To omit the allotment of 6 lakhs for reserve provision at the disposal of the Government.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

769. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,04,000 for miscellaneous and unforeseen charges by Rs. 5,04,000.*

Demand XXXII for 6 lakhs for Reserve with the Finance Department was then put to the vote and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXIII—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, in rising to move the demand of 29.37 lakhs for Agency, I wish merely to say that the provision made this year is, so to speak, starvation provision."

[27th March 1922]

Motions 770 to 772.

The following motions were not made :—

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

770. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,415 for salaries by Rs. 100.*

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

771. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,415 for salaries by Rupees 50,000.*

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

772. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,42,071 for General Administration (Agency) by Rs. 100.*

Motion 773.

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

773. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,42,071 for General Administration (Agency) by Rs. 100.*

“Sir, having had experience of Agency life and service, I can lay claim to speak a few words on the formation of the new Agency district. The budget provision under this head for 1922-23 is 29.37 lakhs, while it was only 5 and odd lakhs last year. The Agency tracts of the three districts of Ganjām, Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari cover an area of 20,000 miles of which nearly two-thirds belong to the Raja of Jeypore and other zamindars ; the rest belongs to the Government. Now the Government propose to open up these 20,000 square miles which will profit largely the Jeypore estate whose income after this exploitation, will increase by leaps and bounds. He pays only a few thousand rupees as *peshkash* for this extensive piece of land. The Government says : ‘it might reasonably be expected that the Raja of Jeypore and other owners of the zamindari properties would agree to give their fair share of burden as they would get a large share of the benefit.’ When the Government intends spending 2.50 crores in five years on this exploitation, I am sure the House wishes to know how much these Rajas will pay either annually or in lump sum, or whether any arrangements to that effect have been arrived at. Before the Government settle this part of the business, I am not for spending such large sums in these private and zamindari lands except as far as they may be necessary for political reasons. As for spending any reasonable amounts in the Government Agency they may do so.

“The expenditure on the Agency establishment has increased with no appreciable advantage to the public. Formerly the Agency tracts in each of the districts of Ganjām, Vizagapatam and Gōdāvari were under the Collectors’ charge, with a handful of officials and there was nothing found defective in the system of administration. The population consists mostly of primitive people, and do not require elaborate machinery of judicial and police establishment. Those tracts were hitherto handled by three divisional officers, and a handful of sub-magistrates and police force. Now the establishment has increased considerably. For instance, there are 1 commissioner, 6 assistant and deputy commissioners, 1 deputy collector, 1 district and sessions judge, 22 tahsildars, deputy tahsildars, 1 district superintendent of police, 3 assistant superintendents, 4 deputy superintendents and 23 inspectors with the necessary increased ministerial establishment, involving a heavy expenditure.

27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu]

I wish to say that, as the people are primitive, no intricate legal question will arise, nor will there be among them any serious crimes. There will be reason when the country is well opened and the people get civilized to have the above establishment. The expenditure on these establishments may be well utilized on communications, etc.

“My next suggestion is that the posts of assistant and deputy commissioner may be reduced to 3, and that they may all be provincial service officers. The jurisdiction may be retained, and a selection may be made from the senior grade of the district munsifs or the junior grade of sub-judges with sessions powers. It is said that an officer who will go to the villages of hill tribes is necessary. Even in such a case, an experienced Indian will serve the need. A two thousand rupees officer is not the only person who can dispense justice to the hill tribes, the population being 12 to 15 a square mile. When there are serious cases to be tried, there is no reason why a senior grade civilian assistant commissioner should not be able, to cope with the sessions work, and why a portion of these sessions cases from a stated area should not be given to the commissioner, if a sub-judge cannot be given these powers. The Agency division is still young and there is no reason why the commissioner should not be able to spare some time for the purpose.

“One thing more, Sir. The sanction of the Secretary of State for India for the constitution of the separate Agency division must have been got at least in October 1920. All the Agency was under the management of the Collectors of the three districts. The Agency portion of the three districts is as large as, if not more than, the plain portions of these districts. We have 5 civilian officers and 2 provincial officers in the cadre, when the same work was done by the 3 Collectors or a few sub-collectors. Does it not stand to reason, that the three district charges, should be readjusted and the number of Collectors reduced? Why was no anxiety shown to effect this retrenchment, while so much haste was exhibited in adding to the cadre? I submit, Sir, that the whole scheme requires looking into. If this is done, I have no doubt that the saving proposed can be effected.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—“I cannot say that the hon. Member has indicated any real possibility of saving. He did not give me any notice of the lines on which he was going to traverse the Agency administration and, it is rather difficult to make a note of a succession of individual criticisms, not one of which is new, and to answer them in detail in the time allotted. I must therefore take only one or two points. In the first place, the hon. Member has contrasted the total allotment of 29·37 lakhs with the figure of five and odd lakhs of last year. He is evidently under the impression, and desires the Council to share that impression, that the expenditure on the Agency has been multiplied something like six-fold in the past year. I can assure him that there has been nothing of the sort. The trouble lies in the fact that the arrangement of the budget heads this year of entering together, for the convenience of this House, all the items relating to Agency is radically different from the arrangement of last year. When the case of the Agency expenditure was put before the Cabinet by the Finance Secretary, that provision for establishment was brought prominently forward and he furnished us then with a statement of additional items of staff. As to the need for the staff which administers the Agency, a variety of information, at one time or another, has

[Sir Lionel Dividson]

[27th March 1922]

been supplied to the House in printed papers and, I am afraid, I cannot, in the time at my disposal, traverse that issue again in detail. I notice with great regret that the mover went out of his way to attack the Raja of Jeypore and zamindars generally in the Agency tracts, as if all those exploitations, or developments as I would prefer to say, which we contemplate, are mainly in the interests of the large zamindars. I must repudiate that point of view altogether. The Government of the province is not concerned with the personal interests of individual zamindars, but it has very much at heart the well-being of the ryots who live in zamindari areas, and it is the ryots who live in those areas who will be more benefited in the long run than the zamindars themselves. That is the main answer to criticisms of the zamindars in general. I regret that our colleague, the Raja of Jeypore, is not here to-day, for I have no doubt he would have answered the criticism directed against him personally.

“There has been a further criticism regarding the employment of a district and sessions judge. With that I will not deal, Sir, not merely because it is non-votable but also because I dealt with it in the general discussion of the budget and pointed out then how the employment of such an officer was in the interests of what Mr. Palmer called the ‘naked and poor Koyas’.

“Before I sit down, I will merely add that the budget was carefully discussed with the Agency Advisory Committee and I can confidently say that except in regard to the item of the district and sessions judge, I carried them entirely with me. If I was able to satisfy the Advisory Committee in regard to points of detail, I think the House may take it that the budget generally is fair and not extravagant.”

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—“I beg to withdraw the motion.”
The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 774 to 777.

The following motions were not made :—

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

774. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,000 for law officers by Rupees 8,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

775. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 29·37 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

776. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 29·37 lakhs by Rs. 100.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

777. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29·37 lakhs by 1 lakh.*

The demand for Rs. 29·37 lakhs—Agency was then put to the House and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXIV—REPAYMENT OF LOAN TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 16·28 lakhs for repayment of loan to Central Government.”

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

27th March 1922]

DEMAND XXXV—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE PROVINCIAL
GOVERNMENT.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 97·83 lakhs for Loans and Advances by the Provincial Government.”

Motion 778.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

778. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

“ Sir, before I make this motion, I should like the Government to give us an opportunity of discussing the scheme as to its suitability or otherwise at the present juncture. Now, we are glad that we are not under a moral obligation to vote this grant. I do not see the advisability of embarking on such a scheme during a year of financial stringency. To a certain question put by Mr. Ramachandra Rao, the Government was pleased to reply that this item was intended for the purpose of employing the Mappilla prisoners who are now in jail. I would submit that it is not proper that these persons should be lodged in jails at Rameswaram, which is considered to be a sacred place by the Hindus. Just as Mecca is to Muhammadans so Rameswaram is to the Hindus. Rameswaram is a place to which millions of Hindu pilgrims resort every year, and if these Mappilla prisoners are taken there, there might be great trouble. As regards the scheme itself, I wish to point out that it would serve no useful purpose for steamers going through to Rangoon and Calcutta. This canal will not be useful unless there is a harbour. The Tuticorin harbour is far away, and a separate harbour at Rameswaram would cost about two crores of rupees. I ask whether we are in a position to pay that huge sum. Consequently, if there is any strategic value in the opening of this canal, I think it is the bounden duty of the Government of India to embark on such a scheme. With these words I make my motion.”

Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, I rise to support the motion. The Rameswaram canal scheme which has been put forward at this time is, in my opinion, not a sound one. No doubt the hon. the Finance Member had told us the other day that the canal scheme was an old one as old as the scheme for the Dhanushkodi crossing to Ceylon. But, Sir, that scheme has been dead and buried these so many years, and why it was resurrected only some months back in connexion with Tuticorin harbour scheme and why this scheme should be made an integral part of the harbour scheme is really inexplicable. Sir, for the past decade or so, the Tuticorin public have been agitating to have a deep water basin in their harbour so as to make the ocean-going vessels touch their port and to load and unload their cargo direct on land. In this scheme the engineering features were complete and it was ready cut and dry. At this stage, Sir, only some months ago, a committee with official preponderance was appointed by the Government to investigate the Tuticorin harbour development scheme. The committee dragged on its sittings to a considerable length of time and arrived at a definite conclusion by a majority of 10 to 5 that the Tuticorin harbour development scheme should be pushed through and the Rameswaram canal scheme should be abandoned. Though this committee has sent in its report long before, why

[Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu]

[27th March 1922]

this was not made public along with the Government orders thereon and why should there be so much of secrecy hanging over it really passes my comprehension. At any rate, Sir, the committee which has sat over it has given its verdict against it, the general public never wanted it, the trading companies at Tuticorin are dead against this proposal, and we the representatives of rate-payers in this Council are most unwilling to sanction a large sum to a scheme of doubtful utility, especially at this time of financial stringency. Has the Government ever consulted the steam navigation companies as to whether they would use this canal for purposes of navigation as well as trade? Sir, I doubt very much that these companies would ever use this canal to more than a moderate extent with so many risks to navigation attending it.

“Sir, this scheme was not yet fully investigated, the engineering features of which were not yet complete, and it is not yet known whether it will be a paying concern or a losing one; and to ask, Sir, at such a juncture, to contribute to such a scheme of a doubtful nature a large sum of the people's money to an extent of 12 lakhs, especially at a time when we are face to face with grave deficits and when our people are suffering from hunger and famine and while this sum of 12 lakhs can safely and profitably be utilized for our own irrigation purposes so as to be a source of immense benefit to our hunger-stricken population, is what I would call a most unsound statesmanship. Sir, if on the other hand, the Government propose to spend this sum on the Tuticorin harbour scheme which has been designed, examined and appreciated by the more competent men, then there would be at least some justification; for, I am sure, it would prove not only a remunerative business, but also the trade and commerce of that port would be placed in a state of high efficiency.

“Then again, Sir, a plea was put forward so as to appeal to the good nature of the general public by the hon. the Finance Member, to find suitable work for the thousands of Mappilla prisoners in a place where they could be adequately guarded. If Rameswaram could be found to be a suitable place for these Mappilla prisoners, I am certain that Tuticorin offers still more facilities for guarding the prisoners there. Then again, another plea was raised by the hon. the Finance Member that the scheme was an old one and it was not pushed through then owing to the objection raised by the Admiralty; but that it has since withdrawn its objection, the work may be pushed through. Well, Sir, I should like to know if ever the Admiralty wanted this to use as a naval basis or as a coastal defence. It never suggested this scheme so far as we are aware of, nor would this scheme ever suggest itself to it, especially at a time when the International Conference demands for disarmament. Sir, these are all the reasons that strongly appeal to us to reject this grant of 12 lakhs.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“Mr. President, I hope I may
12-30 p.m. crave your indulgence it, in order to make this matter as clear
as I can in the briefest possible time, I read out a note which
I prepared for a meeting of members a few days ago. But, I beg leave, before
I begin to do so, to clear away any misapprehension that we are proposing to
take 12 lakhs of the taxpayers' money and to make a final expenditure of
that on this work which, as has been said, is mainly for the benefit of through
traffic steamers. The proposition before the Government is this: a private

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

company is about to be formed to dig this canal and meanwhile we have sought everywhere for possibilities of employing the unskilled labour of thousands of Mappilla prisoners who otherwise would be a cause of enormous expenditure to the country. After examining irrigation schemes and every other scheme we can possibly think of, the best plan we were able to discover was to set them to work on this canal. That is the sole reason why this provision has been put into the budget in rather a hurry. The proposition is that, assuming that a company will be hereafter formed, we shall make over to them the work done and recover from them whatever we have spent on getting it done by employing the Mappilla prisoners on it.

"At the same time I should like to clear away a misapprehension that there has been some secrecy in this matter. We have been blamed for the delay in dealing with the Tuticorin Committee's report. The Tuticorin Committee's report is dated 24th January 1922 and I ask the Council to say whether the Government have had time since then to digest a report of this kind. We have been almost continuously busy on the budget since the end of January 1922. That is the sole reason and there is no secrecy about it. I venture to think that the Council have no reason to complain of delay in the matter when they consider the number of hours that we have spent in this House.

"The following, Sir, is the note which I asked your permission to read.

"I am glad to have the opportunity which this and connected resolutions give me of supplementing the brief statement which I was enabled to make the other day to this Council regarding the Rameswaram canal. As some members of the House are possibly aware, this is a very old project and although it cannot claim to rank in importance with such schemes as the Panama and Suez canals, its object is the same—to shorten the length of one of the world's main trade routes and to effect economies in time and consumption of fuel and thereby reduce transport charges. There is at present a narrow channel known as the Pamban pass which enables small coasting steamers and sailing vessels to pass from one sea to the other. This channel is however quite unsuited for conversion into a large ship canal. Earlier proposals led to a Parliamentary Committee being appointed in 1862 to report on a suitable site for a canal across the island of Rameswaram and the site which they selected and their proposals with others which followed them were under consideration from time to time up to 1884 when a company was actually formed for the construction of a canal but, owing to financial difficulties, no progress was made. In connexion with the proposed Dhanushkodi line the South Indian Railway Company carried out a survey in order to decide the final alignment for the canal and prepared an estimate amounting to Rs. 46 lakhs for the construction of the canal, the necessary swing bridge over it and the lighting and buoying of the approaches. The extension of the South Indian Railway which was part of that scheme has been carried out, but the canal project was not proceeded with owing to objections which were raised by the Admiralty. These objections have now been withdrawn and we understand that the Admiralty would now welcome its construction. The Madras Government have therefore had the question re-examined by the Harbour Engineer whose reports confirmed the view held by a series of experts who had examined the scheme in earlier years that the construction of such a canal is perfectly feasible. His provisional estimate is for a total expenditure of 60 lakhs to provide a canal to a depth of 30 feet and a bottom

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

width of 120 feet. The financial aspect of the scheme has also been examined by an *ad hoc* committee at Tuticorin and that committee estimates that there would be a gross revenue of say 7.59 lakhs which would provide for maintenance and establishment charges at 37 per cent and for a sinking fund and interest at 8 per cent on an expenditure of 60 lakhs. This estimate is probably a conservative one. The actual saving on the voyage from Cape Comorin to Calcutta would be 240 miles and to Rangoon 109 miles, to which must be added the great advantage of avoiding a stormy passage round the island of Ceylon during the monsoon season. The canal would also be of strategic value in times of war, and if it has been in existence it is possible that the career of the *Emden* would have been shorter and less successful. It is, however, with the commercial aspect of the case that we are at present concerned, and as the scale of dues on which the estimate of revenue is based would enable shipping making for Calcutta or Rangoon or returning therefrom to effect considerable economies both in time and running expenses, there is no reason to doubt that on such terms the canal would be generally used. If we accept the conclusion that the scheme is practicable and likely to be financially successful, the next question that arises is by what agency the canal should be constructed. An examination of this question showed that there were three possible alternatives :

Firstly, that the expenditure should be met entirely by the Government, that is to say, either by the Government of India or the Madras Government from loans raised for the purpose ;

secondly, that it should be constructed entirely by a company formed for the purpose ; and

thirdly, that it should be constructed by a company in which the Government should take shares.

"While the subject was under consideration we were approached by Admiral Sir Edmond Slade with the proposal that the canal should be constructed by a company which he was prepared to form, of which half the capital should be found by public subscription.

"As a result of personal discussions with Admiral Slade, the views of the Madras Government were communicated to the Government of India and I now wish to inform the Council as to the conditions on which the Madras Government would be prepared to assent to a company being formed for the purpose. They are that the proposed company should be domiciled and registered in India with a rupee capital and that its operations should, if necessary, be confined to the construction of a waterway, the question of the possible development of a harbour being determined by the actual course of events. The Government would have full control over the rates of canal dues to be levied, although it is obvious that these rates must necessarily be limited to an amount which would afford sufficient inducement to shipping to make use of the canal. The Government would have the option of purchasing the undertaking after a term of say 50 years, and also that of taking up to 51 per cent of the shares of the company. The land which was acquired by the South Indian Railway Company for the purpose would be made over to the company, its market value being credited to Government in the shape of shares in the company. The Government of India are themselves, owing to financial stringency, unable to take up shares ; but they have no objection to the Government of Madras doing so. It will be also open

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

to the Madras Government to reserve their option to take up a certain percentage of the capital for a period of years. There is thus every prospect that this scheme, for the resuscitation of which we are largely indebted to the initiative and interest of His Excellency the Governor will, ere long, become an accomplished fact to the lasting benefit of the commerce not only of the Madras Presidency but of the other provinces on the littoral of the Bay of Bengal.

“As I have already explained, the matter which lends immediate importance to the construction of this canal and which is responsible for this entry in the budget is this. As the House are aware, the large increase of our jail population owing to the Malabar disturbances is imposing a very heavy burden on the finances of the Presidency, and this is enhanced by the fact that it is very difficult to improvise in temporary jails means of employment for a very large body of prisoners. In this connexion, the Rameswaram canal suggests itself as the most promising scheme for getting over this serious difficulty and the Harbour Engineer and the sanitary authorities are at present busy working out plans for their employment on the excavation of the canal. We have ascertained that this scheme will be equally possible whether the canal is constructed by the agency of a company or directly by Government.

“I now turn to another issue which the construction of this canal will raise—an issue, I admit, of the very greatest importance. Parallel with the consideration of this scheme the Government have had under their consideration proposals for the improvement of the port of Tuticorin and it is obvious that the construction of a canal may considerably affect the future of that port. Opinions as to what this effect will be naturally vary considerably. It is clear that, with the construction of the canal, even if it is used primarily merely as a thoroughfare for ships on long distance voyages, there will be a tendency for a demand for certain facilities to grow up, these facilities being in the first place for such essentials as coal and potable water. It is also possible that, if Rameswaram proves a suitable spot for the landing and shipping of certain kinds of cargo, a demand for certain facilities for that purpose will also gradually arise. In the opinion of some, this must inevitably lead to the extinction of Tuticorin as an important port and they would even go so far as to demand that, on this ground, the construction of the canal should be prohibited and that attention should be devoted entirely to the construction of an up-to-date and fully equipped harbour at Tuticorin. Others, again, are of opinion that in any case the canal would be a necessary adjunct to Tuticorin in order to attract the volume of trade which alone could justify the large proposed scheme in connexion with it which has been under examination. In the opinion of the Madras Government it is impossible to say what the effect of the construction of the canal would be, but they have certainly no intention of attempting to force events or to control the future developments of trade by forming plans for the construction of a large port at Rameswaram. At the same time, they hold that it would be a narrow-minded and reactionary policy to obstruct the canal scheme simply because it may lead to developments which would be unfavourable to a particular port, or deliberately to sacrifice wider interests to purely local considerations. They are not unmindful of the fact that much capital has been sunk in the existing port of Tuticorin, but they cannot ignore the

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

equally important fact that, if the plans for the development of a modern harbour at Tuticorin were carried out, the greater part of this capital expenditure would necessarily be of little value. The present town and business quarter of Tuticorin lie at a distance of three or four miles from the only possible site for the new port. Even if it were possible for the Madras Government to raise the necessary capital for that scheme, they would not, as at present advised, feel justified in doing so merely to perpetuate, though with a shorter lead, the present primitive methods by which the cargo is shipped from or discharged into lighters; and an essential part of any such scheme would be the construction not merely of a harbour but of a new port and business quarter contiguous to it; and, so far as business interests are concerned, it would, in the long run, so far as Government can see, make little difference to them whether this new capital expenditure was laid out in the neighbourhood of the new Tuticorin harbour. That is, however, taking long views and it may be that these prognostications will prove false, and it is for this reason that the Government of Madras propose to concern themselves at present solely with the question of the canal. It may be that Tuticorin will retain its existing trade; it may be that its position on the canal route will enable it to extend its trade; it may be that circumstances may prove too powerful and that the existence of the canal will result in the development of a port also in its immediate neighbourhood. As it is, the Government of Madras propose to abstain from any attempt to coerce trade in the interest of any particular theory or locality. They intend to give it free play and let it discover its own requirements and, if possible, to provide for those requirements where and as they discover themselves.

"We are of opinion that the system of preferences is out of date, and, as I have stated, that large and beneficial enterprises should not be thwarted merely because they may run counter to minor interests. These are merely our tentative views. Much has to be done before any final agreement is arrived at. Neither the investigations nor the estimates are yet complete and what has led to the provision in the budget is first the fact that if the money is not provided for now it is likely that we shall have to wait another year to secure it, and secondly, the fact that after an examination of all possible projects for the employment of Mappilla prisoners, this is practically the only one which appears to the Government to combine the essentials of unskilled labour for a very large number of men which will ultimately be remunerative, necessary sanitary conditions and comparatively easy conditions for guarding. The actual sum provided for is the sum which has been set down by the Harbour Engineer to be spent in the course of the year 1922-23 and it will be seen that if the scheme for the entrusting of the canal to a company eventuates, it would not represent a final payment, but it would be recovered in cash or in shares from the company. At the same time, the Government do not propose to embark on any part of the expenditure until they have satisfied themselves as to the soundness of the scheme by every test they can apply, and if the Council would like to associate certain of the representatives of business interests thereon with the Government for the purpose of testing the scheme, the Government would welcome their advice. When I refer to the representatives of business interests on the Council, I have in mind the members for commerce and industry, namely, Sir James Simpson, Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chaturbhujadoss, Mr. Alexander, Sir Muttayya Chetti and Mr. MacDougall, with whom we might perhaps

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

associate, Diwan Bahadur Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu and Rao Bahadur Namberumal Chetti. We are quite prepared, if the Council so desires, to place all these papers before a committee of these gentlemen before proceeding to incur any expenditure on the scheme.

“I would only like to add one word with regard to the entirely new objection that has been raised, that is, that of interfering with the holy island of Rameswaram. I have said that the existing Pamban pass is an artificial structure, and I am not aware of any objection having been raised to that cut being made. Nor do I understand that any such objection has been raised during the half century that this matter has been under consideration. The land has actually been acquired and the inhabitants of this island did not object on the ground that the land was sacred at any stage of the acquisition proceedings. Lastly, as regards the danger of the Mappillas interfering with the inhabitants of the island, of course it is a part of the scheme to fence them off in a separate place, and the advantage afforded by the fact that Rameswaram is an island and that it is possible to use the sea on one side to prevent them from escaping.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Mr. President, I carefully heard the written eloquence of the hon. the Finance Member. I may first mention to him that I am not one of those gentlemen that were invited to hear the views of the Government on this matter, and I do not know the reason why such invitation was not extended to me.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“May, I say, Sir, that the sole reason was that I did not expect a gentleman from the north of the Presidency, to take an interest in this matter. The invitation was sent to the members who had given notice of motions and to others who come from places near Rameswaram.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“I only want to make a request to him, whenever he entertains members for private conversations, he may extend the invitation to other members also.”

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“May I say, Sir, that those who gave notices of motions on this question were asked to meet the hon. the Finance Member, so that we might understand the matter and decide whether to press the motions or not?”

Rao Bahadur V. APPASWAMI VANDAYAR :—“Not only that, Mr. President, but the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter was kind enough to extend the invitation not only to the members who had given notices of motions, but also to others. I have not given notice of any motion, but I went there.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“All right, Sir; I do not think there is any great importance in it. On the merits, I am not convinced of the necessity of now voting for this amount. From the Finance Member's own speech it is clear that it is not a well-matured scheme and that there are many points that have yet to be settled. I am afraid that the Government have not a clear mind of their own on the whole scheme. They have not stated whether they would hand it over to a company or whether they would take shares in it. In this connexion, I want to bring to the notice of this House the treatment that was accorded by the Finance Department to the industrial concerns of the Presidency. The other day, the hon. the Minister for Development said that he was not able to finance or take any shares in the

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [27th March 1922]

paper mills concern at Rajahmundry, because the law does not allow him to do it and he wanted to amend the law. I think that where the Government have got a will they have got a way of devising some method. The present scheme under discussion is a method which the Finance Member devised and he may have suggested the same to the Minister for Development and it would have pleased this House very much. In the same budget, if one sort of treatment is to be accorded to one branch——”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“ May I say, Sir, that the present proposal is to do some work in anticipation of the formation of a company but it is not at present a question of taking shares in a company. I dare say legislation would be required in both cases.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ I respectfully say that the same kind of device was available to help the paper concern.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I ask, Sir, whether these paper mills or cotton mills will provide labour, unskilled labour for Mappillas? That is the reason why we are proceeding in advance.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ When I am speaking on this particular aspect of the question, I completely divest myself of the question of employing the Mappillas. But if work must be found for them, I believe that the Government have got a good many well-matured schemes, sanctioned schemes either of irrigation or of drainage. These are the schemes that more directly concern the people and great attention ought to have been paid in that direction.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I wish to say, Sir, that these were the schemes to which attention was first paid, as I have already said, but we could not find a suitable scheme.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ I have already mentioned, Sir, that where there is a will there is a way. My only complaint is that the Government did not make its will effective towards helping irrigation and drainage projects. That is all my criticism regarding the matter.

“ Sir, in this connexion, when the company itself is not formed, when the plans of the whole scheme and the details have to be worked out and are not known, when the exact cost of the scheme is not known, I think the Government is not justified in coming forward for a vote of this House for this large sum. We do not know what our future commitments will be and whether they may end in gain or loss. When the work is half proceeded with, it may be said that more is required. Is it going to be a burden on the taxpayer for ever? Under these circumstances, I strongly object to the provision in the budget, and I support the motion for omission of this amount.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Mr. President, I may first of all thank the hon. the Finance Member for his courtesy in asking some of us to meet him and discuss this question with him. After giving the matter my most careful consideration, I must say that I have come to the conclusion that no case has been made out for us to invest this money on this scheme, especially when we do not know the full cost it may involve. I am not much perturbed about the Mappilla prisoners being employed in the neighbourhood of Rameswaram. I doubt very much if there are many people who would object to the scheme on religious grounds, and I do not think that in these days such a sentiment should be seriously taken into account,

27th March 1922]

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

"But even as a business proposition, I do not think that we are in a position to say that it can be or will be a success. In the first place, there is the question of competition with Tuticorin. That, again, is a matter on which I do not like to say much because, if the Rameswaram canal scheme is going to be such a clear and certain success, then in the interests of the country it does not matter if Tuticorin is obliged to take an inferior place. One hon. Member raised the question as to whether the estimated expenditure would be sufficient. The estimated expenditure is Rs. 60 lakhs, and reference has been made to the other ocean-connecting canals, like the Suez canal and the Panama canal. In the case of the Suez canal the voyage saved has to be measured literally by thousands of miles, and in the case of Panama too there is the same advantage as it saves a voyage all round South America. But here in the present case the economy effected in the distance is only about 240 miles in one direction and about 100 and odd miles in another. We do not know a single oceanic adventure of this kind that did not cost at least four or five times, the original estimate of expenditure. The Panama canal cost a very great deal more than what it had originally been bargained for and so did the Suez canal, and I am not at all sure that this Rs. 60 lakhs will not be the beginning of a scheme which may involve us in several times the estimated expenditure. After the scheme is completed, this project by itself might not be found sufficient, but a harbour and other things may have to be added later on, though, of course, the hon. the Finance Member guarded himself by saying that one could not foresee the future and the necessary developments that may be required in the future. But I am certain that this amount of Rs. 60 lakhs is an under-estimate. Whether it is an under-estimate or not, we do not know what the details of this estimate are, and we do not also know what factors have been taken into account in launching on this scheme. It is just like asking us to jump before we have had a chance of looking. Supposing that we vote this amount now, more money may be necessary afterwards. Once we vote for it, we would have to go on voting for more money. It has been said that the Council should look at this matter as an investment, and that a company would be formed. In the first place, we do not know what that company is, in what stage it is now, when it would be formed, and so on. It may be formed only when there are fair indications of success, and supposing the indications are otherwise, or that the scheme is going to cost us far more than the present estimate, we are not at all sure whether the company is going to be formed, and if so, under what terms. These things are all in embryo as it were. And then, what is the estimated profit? On the present estimate of the cost, I am told that Government expect to get—I may be corrected if I am wrong—8 per cent. If that is what they expect to get, I am perfectly sure that they can consider themselves most fortunate if ultimately they can get even 2 per cent. For these reasons, I am opposed to the scheme. We could afford to embark on such schemes provided we have surplus money. But this is a year of a deficit budget and a year in which we, as the hon. the Finance Member of the Government of India said, have not turned the corner of our difficulties. This is not a year in which we can embark on a scheme of this kind which would commit us to an indefinite expenditure with very little prospect of success. Again, if the company is formed, the terms read out by the hon. the Finance Member do not in the least satisfy us. There is no provision made in it, there does not seem to be

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

[27th March 1922]

even the idea of making a provision, for a number of higher offices therein being reserved for Indians. It is an important scheme, and it would be necessary to employ a host of engineers and others. We do not know the number that may be employed, and how many of them are going to be Indians, and how many of such appointments will be reserved for Indians. I would therefore ask my friends not to vote for this scheme. The scheme which has been kept pending since 1862 can very well remain as it is for a few more years, and nothing will be lost.

“As regards finding employment for Mappilla prisoners, it seems to me that the whole of this scheme, instead of being started as a business proposition and then worked up down to labour supply, has been worked up the other way, that is, from a labour proposition to a business proposition, which is the reverse of what it should be. This reminds me of an old story of a *rishi* whose *kaupinam* was being eaten away by rats. He procured a cat to get out of the trouble, and he wanted milk to preserve the cat, for which purpose he had to go in for a cow, and he invested money in the purchase of a cow, and so on. Whatever else we do we shall not imitate that innocent *rishi*.”

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—“Sir, I have also given notice of a motion on the subject, and I rise to support the motion now before the House. The hon. the Finance Member was good enough to refer to the Tuticorin Harbour Committee, and also proposed that he would lay that report on the table. I submit, Sir, that so far as that Committee's Report is concerned, what I hear is that they recommended that this Rameswaram canal by itself would be financially unsound, unless it was supplemented by a harbour and a port. Unless this is done—I may be right or wrong, and I would ask the hon. the Finance Member to correct me—the scheme may not be a success.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I give the hon. Member the exact wording? The majority of the Committee were not prepared on the material before them to find that the canal would be commercially profitable.”

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—“May I request the hon. the Finance Member to hand me over a copy of the report, so that I may see whether I am correct in my statement or not? Now coming to the statement that Rs. 60 lakhs are required for the canal—I believe I am right in saying that he said that Rs. 60 lakhs would be just necessary for digging the ditch alone, and then for putting the canal in proper working order—neither the Committee nor the hon. the Finance Member have been able to give us any definite figures as to what that cost would be. I submit therefore that in order to

1 p.m.

have a canal alone in perfect working order we would at least have to spend another 60 or 70 lakhs of rupees so that the total would come to about 130 lakhs of rupees. Then it is said that the advantages are that ocean ships passing round Ceylon to Calcutta could pass through this canal and save the voyage of a day and a quarter or 240 miles, and that we could place a toll upon their tonnage. In order to do this I believe we have got to take into consideration the annual cost of maintaining this canal. What would be the annual cost? No one who knows about Rameswaram can be perfectly sure whether this canal would not be filled up in a very short time, and in order to keep the canal in a working condition we may have to spend a larger amount. The hon. the Finance

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

Member is not prepared to tell us what the cost of the annual repairs would be, and what the cost of the establishment. Add to all these things the expenditure and the capital outlay. And then we have also to consider whether the ships would consider it profitable to pass through this canal just to save a 240-mile voyage if, as I believe, Sir, a toll would have to be raised and raised so much that the ships would not prefer to take this course and would rather find it advantageous to go round Colombo and spend a day and a quarter more. Therefore, I submit, that the advantages that have been so much spoken of and so eloquently described by the hon. the Finance Member are merely in the air. And I do not know whether they would materialize. On the other hand, I am afraid I would have to assure hon. Members of this House that this canal would be rather a big burden upon us. As my hon. Friend Mr. C. R. Reddi said, once we start upon this scheme, God only knows how far we may have to go. We must invest some more money in course of time. Instead of the $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent which the hon. the Finance Member has promised, I do not know whether Mr. C. R. Reddi was not more correct when he said that we should not be able to get even two per cent. The hon. the Finance Member said something about the company that would take up the work of the canal, with or without the aid of the Mappilla prisoners. If I remember right, what he said was that he would work it with the aid of the Mappilla prisoners and hand over the work to the company, ourselves taking a share in the company for the amount that is invested. As the hon. Member said, no expert has been able to assure us that this scheme would be a success. If it is a success, well and good. If not, is the company prepared to undertake it? Is the hon. the Finance Member prepared on behalf of the company to give us that assurance? Even if he is prepared, I can only tell the House that a company which is willing to take up a financially unsound concern is not a company which can be entrusted with this business. And then, so far as the Mappilla prisoners are concerned, the hon. the Finance Member said that one reason why this scheme has been provided for in this budget, is that we have got an enormous number of Mappilla prisoners for whom we must find work. But is that a reason why we should be committed to an initial expenditure of 12 lakhs? It has been stated in the report just now read by the Finance Member that the total scheme would cost 60 lakhs of rupees, and we are asked to commit ourselves to 12 lakhs this year for the simple reason that the Mappilla prisoners should be provided with work. Is that a reason, Sir, I would ask for voting for this allotment?"

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTI:—"I rise to say a few words in opposing the motion before the House. Mr. Ramalinga Reddi mentions the Suez and Panama canals. In these cases the ships have to get round Africa in the one case, and South America in the other case. Rameswaram canal is a canal of four miles, and it does not bear any comparison with the cost of those two canals. If we are so careful and calculating even when we are to spend a small sum, such schemes cannot be pushed forward. There must be some venture, and without venture there is no success. At an informal meeting the other day the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter asked the members present to interpellate. Every one of the members present spoke of his individual scheme. The member from Tanjore advocated taking up irrigation work in his district and suggested utilizing the services of one or two

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chetti] [27th March 1922]

thousand Mappilla prisoners in that area. Another member from Tinnevely observed that the harbour at Tuticorin should receive first attention. Personally I would gladly have this sum of 12 lakhs spent on building houses for the poor in Madras. I only mention these facts that small schemes should be subordinated when schemes involving world-wide interests are under consideration. Parochial schemes should give way to Imperial schemes. This canal has been under consideration for the last half a century, and the present is the proper moment to push it through for the following reasons: (1) The Admiralty which was withholding sanction till now has now withdrawn the objection and is no more standing in the way. (2) A company is willing to work the concern, and private capital should be encouraged to flow when Indian capital, owing to poverty and want of enterprise in the country, is not forthcoming. The most important factor, viz., the ways and means of finding employment for the Mappilla prisoners, which is engaging the serious attention of the Government, is afforded by the scheme.

“As regards the statement that the Mappilla prisoners should not go there, I may state that till now there was no such objection of Mappillas remaining in the island of Rameswaram. I would therefore ask the House to consider not the parochial but those Imperial and broad-based interests which would benefit the world's trade and safeguard the country. For, this canal scheme is advocated by the Government for strategic reasons. We are the ambassadors of the people, and we should guard their interests and should support the well-considered conclusions arrived at by the Government. Far from being pedantic I would here quote a sloka from the great Valmiki:—

अर्थानर्थान्तरे बुद्धिः निश्चितापि नशोभते ।

घातयन्ति हि कार्याणि दूताः पण्डितमानिनः ॥

“We, the ambassadors, should not thwart the mature conclusions arrived at after studying the *pros* and *cons*, and we should not consider ourselves clever and prevent the large and broad schemes being given effect to.

“One other point I wish to bring to notice is as to how our reticence has brought on us this aftermath of the world war. The *Madras Mail* during the war period published two or three articles on “Arthasastra” showing that the Germans followed the system of warfare chalked out in Kautilya's “Arthasastra.” The Germans have translated this work and adopted those modes of warfare. Very likely the Germans have gathered also poisonous-gas fighting. Had we not been reticent we should have been the first to adopt gas-poisoning and end the warfare in a much shorter time and avoided the aftermath of this world war which brought on trade depression, rise in prices, and lock-outs, etc.”

Diwan Bahadur T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—“Mr. President, Sir, I must support the motion to omit the allotment of 12 lakhs in a year of this kind. I am not at all inclined to be an ambassador who does not consider the *pros* and *cons*. But I think the House has absolutely no information with reference to this scheme which appears to be a wild speculation. There are many complicated issues which arise for decision and with these complicated matters which still await decision whether the Government could embark on capital expenditure amounting to 12 lakhs and that in a

1-15 p.m.

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. Desika Achariyar]

year in which we cannot find even 10,000 for the collection of oriental manuscripts, is a matter open to question. This is said to be going to cost Rs. 60 lakhs. I have had some experiences of estimates and I know that original estimates double and triple themselves and even become ten times more than the original estimate. Before we reach the end of this speculation it is just possible we shall have spent 12 crores. Whatever may be the utility of this new venture I do not think it is wise policy to enter upon a speculation of this kind without making the House know everything connected with the different bearings of the scheme and without making the House have sufficient information of everything connected with it. Situated as we are we do not know anything about it and in a stringent financial year of this kind it is not right that we should be asked to embark upon capital expenditure of 12 lakhs upon such a scheme.

“I should therefore advise the House to vote for the omission of this Rs. 12 lakhs from the budget. This amount of money could very well be utilized for the various things which are nearer at hand for which money is needed for expenditure. I have been repeatedly urging on the House the claims of communications, education, medical relief and rural sanitation and the carrying out of the recommendations of the Financial Relations Committee, and all that the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell me was that it was not possible to find the money; yet we are asked to spend Rs. 12 lakhs upon a thing about which we know nothing. This scheme has been brought up on the score of employing the Mappilla prisoners. I do not desire to repeat what has fallen from other Members of the House relating to the advisability of embarking upon this scheme for the sake of finding work for these prisoners. I strongly urge the House to omit this amount from the budget.”

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—“Sir, I do not want to take up much time in speaking on this question, especially after having heard the cogent and convincing reasons advanced by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi and other previous speakers. All that I find is that this scheme is brought before us only on one account, namely, to provide work for the Mappillas who are now prisoners. If that is the real reason, there are ever so many schemes cut and dry, ready for the last so many years on which they may be employed. This House has sanctioned a railway scheme for the district board in Tinnevely. These people can very well be employed there immediately, instead of bargaining over this scheme which is, I should say, more or less a speculative one and about which complete facts and figures are not before us. Therefore, it will be very ill-advised for us to sanction this expenditure. Even if it is merely for providing employment to the Mappillas, there are ever so many other schemes of sanitation, roads and railways where they may be employed at present. For these reasons, I support the motion.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I believe, the frank and free statement made by the hon. the Finance Member has furnished sufficient reason for our accepting the motion before the House and for omitting the provision of Rs. 12 lakhs entered in the budget. He has been good enough to tell us that the investigation is not yet complete and that the estimates have not yet been framed. Simply because we are making a provision out of the loan amount, are we justified in accepting a scheme which is

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [27th March 1922]

in such a nebulous condition and in making a provision for it in the budget? We have also been informed with reference to the report of the committee that the majority were of opinion that the canal scheme alone would not be a profitable concern. We are now concerned with the canal scheme and the only information before us is that by itself it is not likely to be profitable. Are we to give our assent to that scheme on account of the fact that there are other schemes still in store for us, schemes for the improvement of a harbour or a port, which will involve larger expenditure, which will come in the wake of this scheme? Again, we have been informed by the hon. the Finance Member that it is likely to affect the Tuticorin port. With this information before us, I think we should be taking a leap in the dark if we should give our assent to this proposal. I am somewhat surprised that my hon. Friend Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar has found it fit to give his blessings to the proposal. I thought that he, with his considerable business experience, would have rather condemned the scheme as one which no business-man can think of, a scheme which has not been shown to be profitable and which will involve us in a further expenditure of several crores. That such a scheme should be thought of, I submit, is a matter which passes my comprehension. We have been informed that it has been under consideration for the last fifty years and that only shows that those gentlemen who have been considering it did not think it to be so urgent. And, if we have waited for fifty years, we can afford to wait for some years more before we give our assent. Considering it from many stand-points, I think it would be setting up a very bad precedent which might cause considerable inconvenience, if we allowed the provision to stand."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, a good number of observations have already been made on this subject of the Rameswaram canal scheme. I think it is unnecessary at present to examine the merits of that scheme. I am not at all blind to the advantages of doing everything to develop our harbours as far as possible and to afford all facilities for reducing our freight charges. But, Sir, these are questions of far wider importance than those which relate to the provincial Government. My hon. Friend, Sir Charles Todhunter, said that this certainly would save some days' run for some of those ships to Calcutta and to Rangoon. There seems to be nothing particularly provincial about this scheme and, if this scheme is going to be of benefit to all India shipping, I think it is a scheme which ought to be taken up by the Government of India with all its financial advantages and risks in regard to this scheme. I think, therefore, Sir, it would be right on the part of the Government to press this on the attention of the Government of India itself instead of making it a provincial scheme. That is one main consideration. We have nothing to do with the way in which the port of Tuticorin will be affected, for it would certainly be a matter of an all-India policy. I think therefore we need not be very much alarmed by the protests from Tuticorin.

"Reference has been made already to the opinion which has been elicited from the committee which has been appointed with reference to the port of Tuticorin, and that is that the canal by itself will not be commercially a success. That adds to our difficulties, apart from this being more than a provincial concern. Apart from these two considerations, the acceptance of this grant would commit us to take shares in a company which has not yet been formed and to continue to be allied to that company with the option of

27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

purchasing that company out. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter said that legislation would be required. It may be possible. I do not know whether he has been in correspondence with any of those gentlemen who wish to form the company. It remains to be seen, when the matter comes up for legislation and for putting it in the form of a statute, whether any of those gentlemen will back this scheme. We must know what expenditure will have to be incurred in anticipation of the formation of a company. Is there going to be a definite guarantee either by agreement or by contract? I merely suggest the possible difficulties. Sir, I feel very strongly that if we pass this vote it means that we are committed to a company about which we know nothing at present. The legal position has not been ascertained properly and reduced to writing. Legislation is required, and the amount expected to be spent is about Rs. 60 lakhs. Perhaps after partly proceeding with the work, various difficulties may be experienced; perhaps monsoon winds will be filling up the canal and more expenditure will have to be incurred. We do not know what is to come at all out of this business. We know the history of the Madras harbour, the estimated cost of which was very small at the beginning and as years rolled by it swelled up to several crores. There was another irrigation project, the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal, that was given to a syndicate. The whole thing ended in a loss, but it was covered by a guarantee by the Government of India, and the Government of India ultimately purchased the concern at a great loss. It is now paying $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in our provincial estimate. I do not think it is wise, whatever may be the merits of the scheme, to vote for this expenditure at this stage without any further details.

“There is only one other point and that is the Mappilla prisoners. We cannot for the sake of the Mappilla prisoners commit ourselves to a scheme which will cost us immediately Rs. 12 lakhs in the coming year and which will commit us to several crores of rupees hereafter. I therefore think that without going into the merits of the scheme the Council will not be well-advised in accepting this provision. That does not in any way mean that our hon. Friend the Finance Member cannot proceed with the investigation of this scheme and bring it up later on if he finds it financially a sound proposition.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“I do not want to object for a moment to the criticism that the scheme is still in a somewhat nebulous form and has been put forward in somewhat of a hurry. These criticisms are quite justified though I hoped I had met them by saying that the reason why we are in such a hurry about this scheme was that it seemed likely to save us large and wasteful expenditure in some other direction in providing employment for the Mappilla prisoners. In other words, this Rs. 12 lakhs which we proposed to borrow in order to spend on the employment of the Mappilla prisoners we hoped to recover from the company. It seems also to be supposed that we are going to plunge rightaway into this scheme for Rs. 60 lakhs without taking any guarantees or otherwise making ourselves at all secure of the future. I should like to say that the Government are not quite so unbusinesslike as some hon. Gentlemen seem to imagine.

“However, to sum up the discussion, as far as I can gather, the Council have no objection to the scheme in itself, if the company chooses to take the

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

risk in spite of the discouragements that various members have put in their way. Their only objection is that Government should find other means of employing these Mappilla prisoners. If that is the view of the Council, we shall endeavour to do so. But, as I have said, we have only selected this scheme after a careful inquiry and we have been able to find no large irrigation work on which to employ these men. We have got one railway project in contemplation, and so far as I can see that is the only one in which we can suitably employ them, and I am afraid that if the Council reject the proposition we will have to employ the rest of the men on some unremunerative work."

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—"There are new irrigation projects made ready by the Chief Engineer and pending execution, because the House has cut the grants for them."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I inquired about it, Sir. I was told that there is no project in hand on which these persons could be employed, especially any irrigation project in the Tanjore district."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I may say that, if the Council do not permit us to anticipate this scheme by employing the Mappilla prisoners upon the canal, they must be prepared to find the money for employing them in some other way or for feeding them without employment; in other words, we must spend the money without even the chances of the return which this scheme offers us.

"As regards the chances of the scheme, I should like to say that the company who have asked for the concession are a company of business men and they are certainly not likely to go into this thing if it does not promise a fair prospect of return. We have no idea of proceeding with it either without completing the estimates and the investigations, or without securing such guarantees as we can that the company will proceed with the work which we propose to commence. I quite recognize, as I have said, that the Government are not all business men. That is why I said in my opening speech that we were quite ready to agree that we would not spend one rupee on the scheme until the matter has been thoroughly examined by business men. We have on the Council representatives of commerce and industry in Sir James Simpson, Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chaturbhujadoss, Mr. Alexander, Sir M. C. T. Muttayya Chetti, and Mr. MacDougall. We have also Mr. Namberumal Chettiyar who has spoken to-day and Diwan Bahadur Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu from Cocanada. We have a great array of business talent here, and if the Council think that the matter is worth further examination, I would suggest to them that they should ask these business men to examine the scheme and that they should tell us not to proceed with it unless these gentlemen advise us that the scheme was good enough. But I would point out that, if they strike this out of the budget now, it is extremely unlikely, in the last degree unlikely, that we shall be able to get any more money for it this year. If it goes out now, we have got to leave the project to the company and to find some other means of employing these Mappilla prisoners. We have done a great deal of work in getting estimates prepared and trying to arrange for water-supply, and therefore, I do ask the Council to consider whether it is not worth while to let the provision to stand subject to the most

27th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

absolute prohibition that they like to impose on our spending one single rupee of the money unless a committee of business men selected from the Council, after examining the scheme and every paper put before them, says that it is good enough."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I rise to a point of order, Sir. I wish to have your ruling on the question whether it is in order to impose such conditions on a budget motion like this."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That is not a point of order. I understand the hon. Member to mean that the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter cannot impose a condition that the Government would do certain other things in relation to the motion. It is open to the Council, however, to accept it or not. But there is nothing out of order in what the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter has said."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"That is all I wish to say, Sir. I would ask the Council before they reject this motion to remember the alternative we have to face, that we have to employ the Mappilla prisoners, to remember that we are perfectly ready to give them a guarantee that we will not spend a rupee unless the thing passes a most critical examination by a committee of business men and with these words, I leave the matter to the vote of the Council."

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu moved the closure which was put and carried.

The motion was then put and declared carried.

The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter demanded a poll and the same was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 24. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. |
| 2. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Frasad Bahadur. | 25. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. |
| 3. Dr. M. Appalanarasaiah Nayudu. | 26. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. |
| 4. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 27. Mr. P. Siva Rao. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. | 28. Diwan Bahadur T. Desika Achariyar. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ettirajulu Nayudu. | 29. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari. |
| 7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 30. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 8. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 31. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 9. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 32. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. Mr. K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. | 33. Sriman Basi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo. |
| 11. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 34. Mr. M. K. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 12. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. | 35. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu. |
| 13. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 36. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar. |
| 14. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 37. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja. | 38. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 16. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar. | 39. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 17. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur. |
| 18. Mr. A. Subbarayudu. | 41. Mr. A. P. I. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 19. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 42. Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 43. Mr. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 21. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | |
| 22. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | |
| 23. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | |

[27th March 1922]

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 11. Mr. R. Littlehailes. |
| 2. „ Sir Charles Todhunter. | 12. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 3. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad | 13. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 14. Mr. K. V. Ramachari. |
| 4. „ Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 15. Mr. K. Prabhakaran 'Ampan. |
| 5. „ Mr. P. Ramarayaningar. | 16. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai. |
| 6. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi | 17. Mr. G. Vandanam. |
| Nayudu. | 18. Sir James Simpson. |
| 7. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 19. Mr. W. Alexander. |
| 8. Mr. T. E. Moir. | 20. Mr. A. M. MacDougall. |
| 9. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 21. Rao Bahadur T. A. Namberumal Chetti. |
| 10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | |

The motion was carried, 43 voting for and 21 against.

Motions 779 to 792.

The following identical motions consequently fell through :—

Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU :—

779. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12 lakhs for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

780. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

781. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—

782. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

783. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

784. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

785. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

786. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 12,00,000 for Rameswaram canal scheme.*

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

787. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.*

27th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

788. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

789. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans to co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

790. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,15,816 for loans co-operative societies in connexion with the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas by Rs. 100.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

791. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,25,000 for loans to co-operative societies for the acquisition of house-sites for Panchamas.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

792. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 for advances to Kallar co-operative societies.*

Demand XXXV that a sum of Rs. 97·83 lakhs minus 12 lakhs be granted was then put and granted *nem. con.*

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I should like to know, before we adjourn for lunch, what the wishes of hon. Members are in regard to the demands for grants which have been tabled by the Government, copies of which have been furnished to hon. Members. If they are not contentious, I will put them now to the vote ; but if hon. Members would require time, I would take them after lunch. Are they generally non-contentious ? ”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I have given notice of motions regarding two demands.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I think we had better adjourn for lunch.”

The House then adjourned for lunch.

VI

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. and the consideration of the further Demands for grants made by Government was taken up.

DEMAND XXXVI—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ Sir, I beg to move Demand No. XXXVI pertaining to Land Revenue and aggregating in all to Rs. 21,65,000. As the House will see this amount is made up of three items, the largest of which represents expenditure owing to the revision of the salaries of the village officials. It is unnecessary for me, Sir, to once more reiterate the fact that Government had hoped that in view of the financial stringency and in view also of the large uncovered deficit which they had to carry forward in the financial transactions of the next

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

[27th March 1922]

year, this expenditure could easily have been found by the re-imposition of two casses which existed in this province until a few years ago. Bills in respect of those two measures were introduced in this Council, but were turned down at their very first reading. Even after these Bills were turned down, suggestions have been made from time to time by the hon. Members of this House that the claims of the village officials in the matter of increase of their salaries should no longer be deferred, but that they ought to be taken up with effect at least from the next year. In response, therefore, Sir, to the wishes of the House, I am asking them to vote a large sum of Rs. 20,14,600 which is necessitated by the revision of their salaries. While doing so, I feel that it will have the inevitable result of mounting up the already heavy deficit of this province. At one of the previous sittings I have made it sufficiently clear that I would certainly have no objection to bring up this demand before hon. Members, provided they would be prepared to accept the responsibility incidental thereto, in that it would tend to increase the deficit and I felt that the Council was willing to encourage me to go forward in that direction. So, if this vote is now passed, it will merely mean, Sir, that we shall be raising our deficit by that amount and it will practically be at the suggestion of the House that I shall have to request my hon. Colleague the Finance Member to go to the Government of India and secure me a loan to that extent for what is a recurring expenditure.

"The other two items included therein, Sir, are small and the brief note which has been attached below the demand gives a sufficient explanation in regard to them. But if any of the hon. Members would still want any further information, I am prepared to furnish them."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, all that I wish to say in seconding this demand is to ask the House to realize that if this demand is voted, the House takes the responsibility for an addition now to our deficit which has to be covered by loans and for an addition of 34 lakhs to our recurring expenditure."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I understood the hon. the Revenue Member to say that by voting for this demand the deficit will be increased by this particular sum. I take it that the deficit which was in his mind is the deficit shown in the budget presented to the House. In that case, I should like to know, Sir, what has become of the deliberate opinion expressed by this House as regards the reductions effected in several departments, as the 5 lakhs under the Land Revenue Department, one lakh under Forest, etc. Are we to understand then that those reductions which we have indicated should not be given effect to or are not going to be given effect to? Further I am not able to hear from the hon. the Revenue Member as to what minimum pay he is going to fix in the case of village officers and what would be the minimum pay for the proprietary estates village munsifs. On these points I would like to have information."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"Mr. President, if I correctly understood the attitude of the Government in regard to this motion, it appeared to me to be on the part of the Government a half-hearted motion for a grant. Their attitude seems to be that if we commit ourselves to this grant for the enhancement of the salary of village officers, we must be prepared for additional taxation in years to come. If that is the idea behind

27th March 1922]

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

the Government's mind I do not think we should commit ourselves to any particular policy of that sort. The House has expressed time after time that the way in which Government are spending money on salaries and in various other directions is very extravagant, and that the Government must see their way to curtail expenditure in those directions. That view has been several times expressed and I hope before the budget for the next year is prepared, Government will move in that direction and show sufficient saving in various directions and will not come forward with any other bill for additional taxation on this account."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I should like to answer the question that has been asked as to what has become of the saving which the House has effected. The total of the amounts cut out of the budget up to this morning is a little over 11 lakhs. The total of the further demands that have now been put forward, excepting those relating to village officers, is 9½ lakhs, so that the net saving, if these demands are passed, will be comparatively small. As to the prospect of our being able to reduce salaries next year to the amount of another 34 lakhs, I must say that I am not one of the irresponsible optimists who expect a result like that."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" In any case, it seems to me, Sir, that it is very desirable, as has been often expressed in this House, that the pay of village officers should be enhanced and it is expressly with that object that this demand has been mainly brought forward. The other two items are comparatively small and I think that we as a body should vote this grant."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I only wish to make myself clear, Sir, that in consenting to this demand I do not consent to any measure of taxation which my hon. Friend may have in view. It has been stated here in this Council more than once that economy should be practised and that this amount should be found by trying to economize in other departments. Therefore, if my hon. Friend puts forward any measure of taxation to-morrow in order to meet this new impost on our recurring expenditure, I cannot take the responsibility of having consented to it. That again depends upon the measure of taxation and they will have to satisfy us that they have done their level best to retrench in order to find this money. I would therefore make that position clear."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" Sir, I wish to have information on two points. What is the scale of pay which the hon. Member is going to fix? Secondly, is it a supplementary grant for 1921-22?"

2-45 p.m.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" No ; for 1922-23. I will first try to say in one word, Sir, in answer to the question of my hon. Friend opposite to me that in regard to the possibilities of future taxation all I can say is that I am not a prophet to say what the future will be nor can I commit myself as to the policy of taxation of my successors. Of course, it is obvious that the House will see that the amount involved is not only 20 lakhs and odd that I now ask for which represents the pay for eight months. I believe that the increase on account of expenditure per year will be nearly 35 lakhs. Then, Sir, as to the question of scale proposed to be fixed in respect of these officials, so far as the ryotwari village officials are concerned, the House is already aware that revision in respect of karnams and other menial subordinates have already been carried out and

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [27th March 1922]

given effect to. It is only the village headman whose salary has not yet been raised and it was on their behalf that there was almost a demand from this House that their salaries should be increased to Rs. 15 per mensem. In the revision that I have now carried out I have duly given effect to the recommendation of the House and fixed the salary of the village headman in the ryotwari tract as Rs. 15 per mensem. Now in regard to the proprietary areas there was no justification whatsoever to have their pay fixed on the same scale as that which is in vogue in the ryotwari villages. We have taken into account the salaries that are being drawn by the various classes of officials at the present moment in the proprietary areas and we have tried to increase it as substantially as it is possible to do. In the case of the monigars, as they are called, their present salaries are Rs. 4, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 and they will in future get Rs. 8 and the karnams who get now Rs. 15 will be left severely alone. Those who get Rs. 12 will be left severely alone. The karnams who get Rs. 8 and Rs. 11 have been pulled up to Rs. 12. Those who were drawing Rs. 4, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 have been pulled up to Rs. 8 each. The triune officers have been brought on the same level namely, Rs. 8. Their present salaries range from Rs. 2 to Rs. 6. The assistant karnams who were drawing Rs. 5, Rs. 6 and Rs. 7 have been pulled up to Rs. 8. The talaiyaris getting Rs. 3, Rs. 4, Rs. 4½, Rs. 5 and Rs. 6 have been equalized, the minimum now being Rs. 6. The vettians have been likewise pulled up to Rs. 6 each while they have been drawing now Rs. 3, Rs. 4 and Rs. 5. The financial effect of the whole of this scheme, Sir, per year will be, as I have already said, nearly 34 lakhs."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"There is some difficulty in the provision made under this item. We have been informed that the provision has been made for 8 months from fasli 1332. What is to become of the case with regard to the remaining months from April to June? We have already received notice of a demand for 33·40 lakhs for the whole of that year. Is it the object to give the whole pay for 1921-22 or to allow the existing scale for three months."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"The demand which I have tabled in respect of 1921-22 has no reference whatsoever to the salaries of the village officials."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXXVII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour, Sir, to move for an additional grant for 0·74 lakh. This relates to two main items. One is provision for the continuance of the special assistant in the Criminal Investigation Department who was employed during the whole of last year, who was sanctioned for the special purpose of scrutiny of non-co-operation and other political movements and whose principal duty is to gather material for reports to the Government of India. The reports sent up from the Madras Presidency have been characterized by those responsible as being among the best that have been received. I have made very careful examination, including personal consultation with the Deputy Inspector-General, as to the feasibility of dispensing with this appointment during the current year. I have also discussed it at some length with my hon. Colleague the Finance Member. I came to the conclusion that it was absolutely essential to keep

27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

it on and that view has been approved by the Government. So much for that item. The other items consist of special police quartered in the Guntūr district for a period of twelve months, special police at Rāyachōti in the Cuddapah district for a period of twelve months and an addition to the special police in the Gōdāvari district in the Rajahmundry taluk in regard to which an entry will be found at page 115 of the budget. The addition is for the purpose of bringing the quota of head constables up to the standard proportion of one to ten constables. In the case of Rāyachōti the quartering of this additional police was sanctioned by Government in an Order, dated the 28th January 1922, on a very forcible report from the District Magistrate, Mr. Upendra Pai, and in the case of the Rajahmundry taluk the sanction order was dated the 2nd February 1922 and passed on a report from Mr. Bracken, the District Magistrate, drawing attention to the very serious trouble that was being given in respect of civil disobedience and the non-payment of taxes in a group of villages on the banks of the Gōdāvari, 12 miles up stream from Rajahmundry. In each case notice of the quartering of special police has appeared in the Gazette. In the case of Gōdāvari the mere threat was almost sufficient to bring about the restoration of order; and I am not in a position to say whether the additional police have actually been entertained. In the case of Guntūr I must ask for full provision because it is idle to issue a proclamation of that description and not to provide the funds, though there is no reason why the force should not be disbanded if the need for it ceases."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" In view of the information given by the hon. the Home Member, I do not wish to move the first portion--

To omit the provision for the salary of a special assistant to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department.

" But with your permission I will move the second portion, namely :—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 74,000 by Rs. 100.

" So far as this motion is concerned, it is for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is justification or necessity for continuing the punitive police force either in Guntūr or in Cuddapah for a period of 12 months as suggested by the hon. the Home Member. I really do not know in the first instance why this provision was not made at the time of the presentation of the budget. Is it to be understood that it was then thought not necessary to make provision for the continuance of punitive police in the Gōdāvari or Cuddapah district for 12 months and that subsequently the Government found reasons for changing their view? My submission is, Sir, that if at the time of the presentation of the budget it was thought unnecessary to make that provision, the things which have happened since then must have induced them to disband the force rather than order its continuance. We learn that in Guntūr the situation is well in hand and that order has been restored."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I remind the hon. Member that the preparation of the budget commences in October?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" These orders were passed in January or February."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I thought that the budget prepared in the beginning of October must have been brought up to

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

[27th March 1922]

date. Now I do not wish to pursue that point. Still, Sir, I think that owing to the trend of events during the past month, and owing to the fact that the situation has been brought under control in the Guntūr district, I am not satisfied that there is any need or justification for continuing the police force for 12 months more in the next year. Coming to the imposition of a punitive police force in Cuddapah, the justification is much less. All the information which we have, subject to any verification by the hon. the Home Member, is that on account of various troubles and non-co-operation it was thought necessary to have a punitive police force in Rāyachōti in the Cuddapah district. It is not necessary to consider the justification or otherwise of the notification issued by Government. We are now concerned with the question as to the necessity for continuing the police force during the next year also, when things will have fairly settled themselves and when there is not much fear from any quarter whatever in either of these places. Because I feel that there is no justification for continuing this police force, I make this motion for a reduction."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I am afraid I cannot share the hon. Mover's sanguine expectation as to the condition of affairs in the future. I am sure no one wishes more sincerely than I do that his expectation may prove true. But in regard to the Cuddapah district I may say that I have seen to-day a report from the District Magistrate, dated 26th March, in which he presses for this measure. *He* does not say that it is no longer necessary. His original justification covered four pages of print, and I can assure the House that it was a very full justification for the measure. The situation in that part of the Cuddapah district was very serious indeed, and I am assured that the effect of the announcement of the quartering of special police has been excellent.

"In the case of the Guntūr district, the circumstances are much the same.

3 p.m.

As a matter of fact our first information indicated that it would be necessary to recruit at least 300 special police. But in consequence of the very efficient measures taken by Mr. Vernon for the restoration of order it has been found possible not only to arrange for the troops to be sent away almost immediately—I believe it is only a matter of days—but also possible to restrict recruitment of the special police by limiting the number to something like 200. Whether it will be necessary to continue their employment for the whole period of 12 months I cannot at this moment say. But it is obviously necessary that provision should be made. I do ask the House to give Government the powers which, after a very careful consideration, they believe to be necessary in order to secure the State against any recrudescence of the very serious troubles which broke out in the Guntūr district. I can assure the House—I am speaking for my successor—I can confidently assure the House that if the necessity for this additional police disappears at any time the Government of Madras will be the first to dispense with it. But I do ask that we should not be deprived of that form of assistance now."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—"Mr. President, I find in this demand a provision made for a special assistant to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Criminal Investigation Department. May I request the hon. the Home Member to say whether this officer has been asked to retire originally, because I do not find any provision made in the budget?"

27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"The late incumbent of this post has, I believe, actually retired, or will retire at the end of this month. But the question of the personnel of the appointment does not arise now; it is the continued existence of the appointment on a temporary basis for which we are asking."

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU:—"What I want to ask is whether at a time when we have not got funds it is not advisable to have an officer on a lower salary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I think that is probably what will happen. But I am not aware yet exactly what officer will fill the post."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, so far as the Cuddapah district is concerned, I am rather afraid that an exaggerated view has been taken of the situation there. I do not know what report the Collector has made in the matter. It will be, I think, an advantage to the House if a copy of the report is placed on the table so that we may judge for ourselves how far its conclusions are justifiable. The member for the Cuddapah district has assured the House that imposition of the punitive police in his district is not at all justifiable, and I think one can safely take Mr. Narasimhachari, the member for the Cuddapah district, as one who is not at all likely to underestimate any danger that may exist there. So, I do appeal to the hon. the Home Member not to make up his mind that punitive police is absolutely necessary there or that it should continue there for a long time to come. I hope he will be very glad to know soon that the reason for this does not exist, and if he is convinced of that I hope he will surely take away the police from that area."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB Bahadur:—"As one representing the Ceded Districts constituency, I think it my duty to raise my voice of protest against any attempt to continue the punitive police in the district of Cuddapah. Sir, there is not any member of this House who does not regard the maintenance of law and order as the primary duty of the Government. But, Sir, this proposal to continue the punitive police for 12 long months in some of the districts is absolutely inexpedient."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I have already said that they will be dispensed with if at any time the district authorities can satisfy the Government that they are not required."

SAIYID MUHAMMAD PADSHA SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, it is not definitely known how long this force will be continued. But the amount of grant demanded goes to show that the force is to continue for something like a period of 12 months. On that ground I make my observations. Now, in view of the present state of affairs, I think it is altogether unnecessary that this punitive force should be continued in the Cuddapah district. It is a plain fact that the situation has improved everywhere. It is also admitted that even in those parts which were the most recalcitrant and where there was disturbance, there is such an improvement that there hardly seems to be any necessity for the imposition of such a force. It has been said that the District Magistrate of Cuddapah recommended the continuance of this force. I should like to know whether he has given any tangible circumstances; whether he has given any account of the present state of things in Rayachōti which necessitate the continuance of this force there. In the absence

[Mr. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib] [27th March 1922]

of anything definite, in the absence of any further disturbance there, in the absence of any concerted attempt on the part of the people there to disobey law and authority, I believe we will not be justified in imposing this hardship upon the people of a district like Cuddapah, which is already very hard hit on account of frequent famines that visit that district. Now, Sir, it is a fact that there were some disturbances in Rayachōti, that some village officers did resign; but all that thing is now gone. The disturbances are now quelled and the village officers are resuming their duties. Under such circumstances, Sir, it seems to me that the House will not at all be justified in persisting in continuing the punitive force there when it is no longer required."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I only wish to add a few words in regard to the situation in the Guntūr district. I do not know whether the hon. the Home Member made a statement also in regard to the Guntūr district that as soon as conditions are reported to be favourable by the district authorities, the Government will withdraw the punitive police from that district. All that I can say is that from various communications that have appeared in the press from time to time, there is no doubt that the situation in Guntūr has materially improved, that the special collection establishment that was appointed has been withdrawn and that almost the whole revenue of the district has been collected and the Government themselves have been furnishing us information through the district gazette which shows that things have so materially improved that the question as to the appointment of punitive police should be considered by the Government again. I think, Sir, that it is conceivable and it is borne out by experience, that while things are settling down and people are returning to their normal occupations, the presence of a punitive police would itself be a source of irritation. I am sure the hon. the Home Member would have noticed the statements made in the press from time to time. I do not wish to say anything about them at present, but I know from past experience that the punitive police while they are discharging their unpleasant duties are not discreet in their actions. I do not wish to dilate at length on the terms of the notification that has been published recently. But for the present I should like the hon. the Home Member to consider whether in view of the improved situation in the Guntūr district, it would not be doing a wise thing not to impose the punitive police there. The hon. the Home Member says that it is quite likely that people may think that it is only an idle threat of the Government. But I am sure people in Guntūr do not think that the Government are in a mood to indulge in idle threats and I do think that this question of taking punitive steps may defeat the very object of the Government and may end in the promotion of disturbances. Under these circumstances, I trust that the hon. the Home Member will be able to say that this punitive police will be removed as early as possible from Guntūr. The provision is for 12 months and there is always a tendency that when once a provision is made for 12 months it is more than likely to continue till the end of the period. It is quite likely that the hon. the Home Member may receive some report on the state of things in Guntūr justifying the continuance of the punitive force. People will have to pay for the whole of this and the discriminating treatment which that notification provides will cause further trouble in that locality. Therefore, without referring to the terms of the notification on the present occasion and confining myself strictly

27th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

to the financial position, I trust that the hon. the Home Member will hold out an assurance that even if he appoints the punitive police, they will be quickly withdrawn."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I cannot bind my successor by definite assurance in such a matter. In another four days I shall be gone. But I have no doubt that my successor, whoever he may be, will look at it from the same standpoint as myself. That is to say, if he does not deem it desirable to retain the police force either in Cuddapah or in Guntūr, and if the necessity for their presence is clearly gone, then they will be disbanded. But with reference to the suggestion that there is no longer any such need, may I say again, that in respect of Cuddapah I have information from the District Magistrate, dated 26th March, and it is not in accord with that put forward by the hon. Member from Bellary. I may also say that the disturbance in Rayachōti taluk reached its climax only in December last and that it is not a mere case of non-payment of taxes. There were successive acts of brutal violence particularly against forest officers."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Did any of them end in conviction ? "

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" One particular case against six leaders of the movement ended about the middle of December and heavy security was taken from all six accused. That is one case. In another case a village munsif who was the ringleader in the matter was arrested in a raid admirably planned at the dawn of day by the gallant District Superintendent of Police, Mr. Saunders, whose behaviour throughout the troubles in Cuddapah has been beyond all praise. The result was that 17 other persons were arrested and identified as having taken part in a brutal assault on a forest range officer, who was severely assaulted, beaten and robbed of his revolver. They were all charged and I believe a majority of them were convicted. I have not the exact information. But I do know that in the house of a village munsif, there was found an unlicensed gun. He is now on his trial for the possession of this. I need not go any further with the case for additional police in Rayachōti taluk except to say that I think it will probably be quite possible to publish the District Magistrate's report *in extenso* but that is a point which requires some further examination though I see that the papers were sent to the Publicity Officer. As a rule, the Government do not publish *in extenso* matter which is not of sufficient importance. But I see no reason why the bulk, if not the whole of this report, should not be published. I will again examine that question.

" In regard to Guntūr I placed implicit trust on Mr. Vernon and I think he has justified the trust reposed in him. His judgment has been sound and his action restrained throughout and discreet. I saw him immediately before he went there and again afterwards when he came to Madras for a few days. It was on Mr. Vernon's suggestion that we reduced the additional police from 300 to 200. But as to withdrawing them immediately, it is only right that I should remind this Council that very shortly I shall be coming forward with an application for an additional allotment for the purchase of four ' Ford ' vans for the purpose of facilitating the transport of small bodies of armed police from one place to another so as to reduce the necessity for adding to their number by making them more mobile. The intention is that some at

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[27th March 1922]

least of these four 'Ford' vans should be located temporarily in the Guntūr district. We had experience of the necessity for some such form of transport in Madras throughout the months of July, August, September and October 1921 for the purpose of moving troops and police. Motor transport of some kind was found to be very necessary in those days. Hon. Members who read the newspapers will have noticed that the United Provinces have provided no less than 54 'Ford' vans."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" May I ask the hon. the Home Member whether he published the report of the District Magistrate as he received it? We are as anxious as the hon. Member for the maintenance of peace and order. We should like to know whether there is real necessity for the continuance of the punitive police."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I do not think there is any one in this Council who wants to weaken the hands of the Government in the maintenance of law and order. The only point for consideration is whether there is any necessity for the continuance of the punitive police force. The hon. the Home Member stated that if he or his successor was satisfied that there was no necessity to continue the police, they would take steps to disband the force."

"I wish to ask whether in the light of the information he has placed before the House, it is necessary to make full provision for twelve months. I cannot really understand why provision should be made for twelve months. Provision might be made for some shorter period and in the interval if some unfortunate incident should occur, then the Government may come to us for supplementary grants. Why I object to the continuance of this force for a longer period is because, even in normal times when there is peace in the country a punitive force is likely to cause provocation and irritation. It is in the interests of the maintenance of law and order that they should not be continued beyond the actual necessities of the case and their continuance is likely to cause breaches of peace. There is still another difficulty when one goes to the question of apportioning the cost of the punitive police among the persons in the affected locality. We know that the solving of that question often gives rise to further discontent and irritation which it is not easy to comprehend or measure. In the matter of the distribution of the levy of cost, the district officers are given a wide discretion. They have to act upon the recommendation of the subordinate officers which I have not the slightest doubt is causing, has caused and will cause extreme dissatisfaction. If we believe in some of the reports published in the press last night, it will be found that persons who were wearing 'kaddar' are called upon to pay punitive tax on the mere ground that they are wearing 'kaddar'. I am only speaking from the reports published in the press and I do not know how far they are correct. If these reports are true, it is not a matter to congratulate the Government upon. No civilized Government can raise any objection for a person wearing any dress he likes. After all 'kaddar' is only swadesi. If the report in the press is true, it only goes to show that a person is put down as non-co-operator for the mere reason that he is wearing 'kaddar'. Can anything be more unreasonable than to call upon a person to pay punitive tax for the mere reason that he is wearing a particular kind of dress? Incidents of that kind due to the acts of officers in whom the Government have confidence tend to create grave dissatisfaction and discontent in the minds

27th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

of the people. I think even now the hon. the Home Member may go into the whole question very carefully and see if it is necessary to continue the punitive force which is likely to cause grave dissatisfaction. Even in cases where these punitive forces are imposed, specific instructions should be issued to the police not to cause such irritation or discontent. If the reports are true that simply because a man is wearing 'kaddar' he is called upon to pay a punitive tax then I cannot imagine anything more atrocious or outrageous in the matter of levying the cost on the citizens of the country. I hope the hon. the Home Member will examine the matter again or will leave instructions to his successor to see that these punitive forces are disbanded at the earliest possible opportunity. I do not therefore wish to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.74 lakh under Demand XXXVII—Police was put and carried

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXVIII—SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.01 lakh under Demand XXXVIII—Scientific Departments.

"This demand is in addition to Demand XIV—Scientific Departments other than Hydro-Electric Surveys, and provides for the payment of a grant of Rs. 1,000 to the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute has undertaken to publish a critical edition of *Mahabharata*. At present we have not got a critical edition of that great epic. In the interests of Sanskrit philology a large and influential committee of Orientalists have been formed in Poona and they have undertaken this work. Dr. Thomas the famous orientalist of the West, undertook this work some years ago, but he left it incomplete. As the work was not completed as intended, this committee was formed in Poona for the purpose of carrying on this work. They requested the help of this Government for some contribution towards the publication of this critical edition of '*Mahabharata*'.

"In speaking of this undertaking, Sir R. Bhandarkar said that a critical edition of the *Mahabharata* had been one of the greatest wants of Sanskrit philology. This scheme was evolved in Europe as far back as 1901 for an edition of the type wanted. Their original idea seems to have been to aim at a critical edition of the epic and still it is to be presumed that the same is their idea now. Such a critical edition is very essential now. These are in brief how matters are generally understood to be. The committee that is proceeding with the work at Poona consists of eminent scholars and philologists, not merely persons who are well versed in oriental languages but those who have gone through a training of critically studying Sanskrit literature. One of the famous Sanskrit scholars of Western India is the president of the committee and there are about 24 other persons who are all Indians engaged in the work of editing *Mahabharata* in a critical form. The Government have promised to help to the extent of Rs. 1,000. This work is to be conducted in collaboration with the work that is going on in Europe under the guidance and advice of the famous orientalist Dr. Thomas."

[27th March 1922]

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.01 lakh under Demand XXXVIII—Scientific Departments was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XXXIX—EUROPEAN EDUCATION.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 0.18 lakh under Demand XXXIX—European Education. This demand provides for a further expenditure of Rs. 18,000 on the Lawrence Memorial school, Ootacamund. When I was dealing with an earlier demand, in relation to that school, I had occasion to say that the provision of 2.92 lakhs inserted in the budget was definitely below the standard adopted in the current year. In my judgment another Rs. 18,000 is absolutely necessary. The resultant total of 3.10 lakhs falls short by Rs. 19,000 of the proposals of the committee, and I may add that the amount in issue comes from an Imperial assignment.”

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.18 lakh under Demand XXXIX—European Education was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XL—NON-EUROPEAN EDUCATION.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.65 lakh under Demand XL—Non-European Education. This demand is in addition to Demand XVI—Non-European Education and provides for the carrying forward to the year 1922–23 of the balance of the building and the hostel grants for 1921–22 which has not been spent in that year. The money is very necessary to meet demands by managers of schools who have already commenced work in anticipation of grants.”

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 0.65 lakh under Demand XL—Non-European Education was then put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND XLI—INDUSTRIES.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 10,000 for industries.

3-30 p.m. The House may remember that in my reply to the resolution moved by Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar I promised to appoint a committee to go into the whole question of industrial and technical education. The personnel of the committee has been settled. But before we issue the Government Order we should like to take the permission of the House for the expenditure. The teachers and the school authorities of the various industrial and technical schools have to be consulted so that we might benefit by their experience while arriving at conclusions. They are living in various places of the province and travelling allowances have to be paid to them if their evidence is to be taken. This amount is urgently required and I hope the House will grant it.”

The motion was put to the House and carried, and the grant was made.

27th March 1922]

DEMAND XLII—GRANTS TO LOCAL BODIES.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 5,00,000 for grants to local bodies. The amount is required to enable the Local Self-Government Department to subsidise the specially poor local bodies which in spite of their efforts to improve their sources of income have not themselves been able to make both ends meet. I would request the House to pass this demand."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I should like to ask the hon. Minister whether this is really a compassionate demand to make up the deficit in the balance of the local bodies."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" This amount is intended to meet special cases. If local bodies in spite of their efforts are unable to find their way to make up the deficiency in their budgets the Government may have to help them."

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS (RESERVED).

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I have the honour to move for an additional grant of Rs. 5,000. The object of this additional grant of Rs. 5,000 is to bring the total of Rs. 20,000 shown on page 6 of the Public Works Budget estimate in the tabular statement under the heading 'Residences of the Governor' to a sum of Rs. 25,000, which represents the annual allowance for what are called 'Minor Original Works'. These are items which it is within the power of the Military Secretary to sanction. The defect which is found in the original provision lies in the fact that Rs. 7,000 is entered against the Nilgiris, and Rs. 13,000 against South Presidency, but nothing against the third and last head, namely, the Electrical Engineer, who ought to have some funds available for minor works classed as 'original'."

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIV—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS OFFICERS (TRANSFERRED)

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,51,000 for Civil Works—Public Works officers—Transferred. This demand is in addition to the amount already sanctioned for Civil Works. This is to provide for alterations to the Central Jail, Coimbatore, and to the barracks at Bellary which are being used for jail purposes. The object of the alteration is to use them for Mappilla prisoners. My hon. colleague, the Law Member, has already explained the need for the expansion of these buildings. The labour of the Mappilla prisoners will be used in the construction of these buildings and in the adjustments of the various portions of the barracks. Therefore I move for this grant of Rs. 1,51,000."

The demand was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLV—PENSIONS.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 21,000 under the head of Pensions, the object of which is to pay Rs. 300 each to the families of the Mappilla prisoners concerned in the train tragedy."

[27th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

To reduce the demand of Rs. 21,000 for Pensions by Rs. 100.

"In making this motion it is not my object to suggest that these unfortunate persons belonging to the families of the Mappilla prisoners should not be given this pension; but it is to draw prominent attention to the fact that we are called upon to vote this amount even before we know anything of the orders of the Government upon the Committee's report. In the ordinary course we should expect the Government to place the final orders on the now well-known train tragedy as a result of which 70 Mappilla prisoners died, and then come forward for a demand for pensions to the families of the prisoners. I need hardly draw the attention of this House at this closing day of our session to the circumstances which led to the tragedy. There was a full dress debate in this House on the motion for adjournment on the train tragedy, as to the circumstances which led to that unfortunate affair. Objection was taken to the very constitution of the Committee from various quarters. After that incident we have got an inkling of what is now known as the white-washing report of the Committee appointed to inquire into that matter. It has earned the unenviable reputation of being a white-washing report."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" May I ask, Sir, whether all this is in order? Does the hon. Member desire not to pay any pensions?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The motion is perfectly in order. One of the ways by which an hon. Member can show his disapproval of the Government is to propose the reduction of a grant."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Thanks, Sir. It was after a definite discussion in this House regarding that question that we had an inkling of the report of the Committee. It caused grave dissatisfaction in this country that some idea of that report was published by the medium of the English papers in England, that we should not be aware of anything till after we got it through Reuter's agency. Shortly afterwards the Government explained their position and made us understand the circumstances under which the report found its way home. Sir, we were anxiously expecting even afterwards that the Government would finish their examination of the various incidents, arrive at a definite conclusion and inform the public of their conclusions. There is no question in recent times which has caused so much consternation as the incidents relating to these unfortunate Mappilla prisoners who died. It was, I believe, in the month of February that Mr. Ramachandra Rao raised the question as to what was done in regard to this incident. We were informed by the hon. the Home Member that orders would be passed at an early date, probably in the course of a week."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" That I hoped, Sir."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Yes, that he hoped. A month has elapsed, and we have not had any idea whatever as to the orders of the Government relating to this important incident. The Council is about to be prorogued and the Council will not have any chance of discussing the orders of the Government till it again meets in August. If we move the matter in August we may be told, and we have to be satisfied with that, that

27th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

it will be a belated discussion on the report. We are placed in this unfortunate position. The anxiety of this Council in raising the urgent motion was apparent to every one. The Council was anxious to induce the Government to pass orders on it to enable it to deal with it. Notwithstanding the anxiety, and whatever excellent reason the Government might have, the Council has not succeeded in eliciting any information in regard to this matter even on the last day of the session. I must say that it is certainly unreasonable on the part of the Government to come forward with a motion for the grant of pensions to the families of the Mappilla prisoners at this stage of the discussion. If they thought that this was an urgent matter, which required a vote of this Council, they must certainly have hurried the publication of their orders and thus satisfied the Council as to the reasonableness of their proposals. Without doing anything of that sort, to come to this Council for a vote of the pensions is, I submit, quite improper. It is to protest against the manner in which this question has been dealt with by the Government that I have given notice of this motion, not that I am so unreasonable as to suppose that this money should not be granted to the families of the Mappilla prisoners."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the report on the Mappilla train tragedy for the excellent reason I gave before, namely, that it is not possible to discuss those issues until the Government have arrived at a definite conclusion. It is perfectly true that I said I hoped the Government would be able to arrive at a decision in a week's time. I do not remember the exact date of that statement, but my recollection is that His Excellency the Governor had almost immediately afterwards to proceed to Delhi and that two or three members of the Cabinet did the same, while on their return to Madras the sittings of this Council began and have since continued almost from day to day. My own idea about this matter was that it would have been emphatically preferable to announce the decision of the Government to compensate the families of the deceased Mappilla prisoners simultaneously with the publication of orders on the report. But I felt, and I feel, that it would not be fair to the dependents of these persons to delay the payment which we believe is reasonably due to them in the circumstances of the case, merely because it has been found impracticable to publish the final decision of Government on the questions raised in the report as early as personally I had hoped. For that reason I specifically urged that the grant of compensation should form the subject of a separate order. It would clearly be unjust to the families affected to keep them waiting indefinitely, if they are to receive anything at all. I for one see no reason whatsoever why the question of giving compensation to the families of these prisoners who lost their lives owing to this most regrettable incident should be mixed up with the responsibility for it. It seems to me that the two issues are perfectly distinct and that there is no reason to delay the settlement of the one because the immediate settlement of the other has been found impracticable."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I want to say one or two words in connexion with this demand. I do not believe
 3-45 p.m. that any member in this House will be for refusing this small amount of Rs. 300 to each of the families of the unfortunate persons who died in that train tragedy. But at the same time we regard it as extremely unfortunate that the Government should have deemed it fit to come before this House with this demand before publishing the report of Mr. Knapp's

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[27th March 1922]

committee and also the conclusion at which the Government have arrived or propose to arrive. My friend the hon. the Home Member says that this House should not mix up these two questions, namely, the grant of this compassionate allowance of Rs. 300 each to the families of the deceased persons and the occurrences connected with the tragedy. I cannot, for a moment, understand how my hon. Friend the Home Member regards these as two distinct issues. They are so inseparably connected one with the other that to my mind it is not possible to dissociate the one from the other. Suppose a person is hanged after a judicial trial. Nobody would think—and the Government would not think—of giving any money to the family of that person who has been hanged and who is dead. The very fact that the Government thought it necessary to give this amount of Rs. 300 each to the families of these deceased persons shows that they are conscious that there was some wrong at the bottom."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"That point has never been disputed from first to last. It was always recognized by the Government that that was a regrettable, a most regrettable incident, and that is the reason why it is now proposed to give recognition to those who have suffered from it beyond the penalty allotted by the law. That is a perfectly simple question distinguishable from the question of disciplinary action and the affixation of responsibility. I cannot understand any one holding that the two issues are not separate."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"The hon. the Home Member said that it was admitted by them that a regrettable tragedy had happened. If all of us recognize that a regrettable tragedy has happened, I cannot understand the reason of the hon. the Home Member losing his temper, getting up and interrupting me when I was making a statement which was accepted by himself."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I rose because of the inference drawn."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I still adhere to this inference, and I repeat it. And that inference is that the very fact that the Government have thought it necessary to give this sum of Rs. 300 to each of the families of those unfortunate victims shows that they are convinced that there has been something very unfortunate in connexion with that incident. My point was and is that the grant of this compassionate allowance and the verdict of the Government and, I suppose, of the public with reference to the main incident are so inseparably connected, one with the other, that they cannot be separated. So that, as I said, I do not want to use very strong language in connexion with this matter particularly as the hon. the Home Member said that he would be leaving this country—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have no desire to ask the indulgence of the hon. Member if he wishes to criticise me, on the score that I shall be leaving shortly. I am quite prepared to stand any criticism."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"But it is not with reference to his willingness that I am making that remark."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Then, what, Sir, may I ask, was the point of suggesting indulgence to me personally or the reference to the fact that I am shortly leaving this country?"

27th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I am not prepared to answer that question. In spite of my hon. Friend the Home Member losing his temper—I wish to regard him still as my friend—in spite of that, I continue to hold that there is an inseparable connexion between the two, and that is, as I was submitting before I was interrupted, in the case of the families of members who are hanged or who die in prison after conviction, we do not think of granting compensation to their families. So that I emphasize—and I repeat it—that this very fact that the Government have thought it necessary to grant this amount shows that there is an inseparable connexion and that it is very unfortunate that the Government have thought fit to come before this Council without publishing the Knapp Committee's report and the conclusion arrived at by that committee. My object is not to oppose the motion. Indeed, I should have been very glad to vote even a larger amount than this sum of Rs. 21,000 if the Government had come before this House in the proper way.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I should like to make a few remarks on the position that has been created by the non-publication of this report. Sir, as you have remarked on the point of order, this is the only way in which we the members of the Legislative Council can express our dissatisfaction with the Executive Government in a matter of this kind. The broad facts are that this incident, this unfortunate incident took place some time about the 19th of November. The Government immediately appointed a committee, almost the same day on which this incident was brought to their notice. That committee has not yet published the report of their deliberations. I believe, at the February meeting, I tabled a question, with your special permission (that was at the end of the meeting) whether the Government would afford us facilities for the discussion of that report, whether they would afford facilities for expressing our opinion on that report and whether steps would be taken to give us that guarantee because it was almost at the end of the session. The answer was in the negative. Sir, this attitude taken up by the Government came upon me as a very great surprise. In all constitutional assemblies, when matters of importance have to be discussed, the Government afford facilities for those who do not agree with them for the discussion of those matters and to come to a mutual understanding. And knowing the constitutional practice elsewhere, I suggested to my hon. Friend whether he would afford us an opportunity for that discussion. The hon. the Home Member told us that he was not prepared to give us that opportunity. In a supplemental question I elicited information as to whether they had come to any conclusion on that matter. He then said that, as far as possible, they would try to expedite orders and that it would be in a week or so. My hon. Friend Mr. Moir, on more than one occasion expressed disappointment with the reforms—”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ I do not remember any single occasion on which I expressed disappointment with the reforms.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I am quite willing to bring to his notice what he said in referring to duty allowances. He said the proceedings of this Council have given no justification for the misapprehensions which they have raised. That was one instance. Again, speaking on the question of depressed classes, my hon. Friend made a reference to the protection which the reforms was expected to give—”

[27th March 1922]

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"The hon. Member has misquoted and misinterpreted what I said. I do not know whether my views as to the success or otherwise of the reforms are relevant. If they were, I should be quite prepared to explain what I did say. But I cannot see what my views as to the reforms or protection of the depressed classes or anything else have to do with the question of grants to the unfortunate families of these poor men."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"If my hon. Friend had waited a little he would have seen my point. I was going to express our apprehensions as to how the reforms have been worked."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"I should be glad if he would quote me correctly."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"To the best of my recollection, I did not want to misquote any member. Here is a new assembly set up, which is a new departure of Government by discussion. Hon. Members have been trying to get at the report in order to express their opinion on it. What is the attitude of the Government in an occasion like that? It is an attitude of absolute blocking up of this matter without giving an opportunity for discussion. I do not want to go into the exact grounds for this delay. There the fact remains. We are now on the last day of this session and we shall not meet for four months. So I wanted to give the hon. the Home Member and to the House an opportunity of raising a debate on a point which has led to considerable discussion already in this House. I expressed my own apprehensions. It was not Mr. Moir's apprehensions. Should not this House be given an opportunity of stating its views on a matter of this kind? Is it not the duty of this Government to give us those facilities for an expression of our opinion? That is the essence of the reforms scheme. It means that we are going exactly the same way that we were going in the pre-reform days. I was expecting that a change would come in the procedure of the House, in the attitude of the Government and of the non-official members of this House. I trust several hon. Members will share my disappointment that this change has not come over the Executive Government of this Province. That is the point of my friend Mr. Moir's apprehensions and my apprehensions."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"Mr. President, I do not propose to deal with the point raised by Mr. Ramachandra Rao in regard to my apprehensions about the reforms. I will only say that he has misquoted and misinterpreted me, and if he will wait for the official report of my speech to be published, and if he is not yet convinced that he has unintentionally misquoted and misinterpreted me, I am pretty sure that I shall be able to convince him."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I shall be very glad to have my friend's interpretation."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—"The point now in question is whether this grant to the families of these deceased Mappilla prisoners should be given or not, or whether it should be reduced. I cannot follow the mental processes of my hon. Friend sitting opposite by which he arrived at the conclusion that the question of this grant is inseparably connected with the question of the report on the train tragedy and that the Government ought not in advance of their decisions to put forward a demand for some recognition of the sufferings, which, beyond the intention of the law, have been inflicted on the families of those unfortunate people. I cannot understand the suggestion that a grant should not be given until the Government have pronounced their

27th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

decision on this report. I would ask the hon. Member whether he does assert that the question whether such compensation should be given or not could possibly depend on what the Government's decision is on that report, on whether one or more or no one can be held responsible. The hon. the Home Member has endeavoured to explain to the House the circumstances which have led to the postponement of the announcement of their decision, and I have nothing more to say on that point. But surely the hon. Member would not say that the provision of this relief to the families of those unfortunate victims should be further postponed. The relief is wanted now and I trust the House will not defer consideration of the questions whether that relief is wanted till it can meet again after the announcement of the decision on the report; it may be four months or five months hence. I sincerely hope that the House will consent to this grant of relief to the unfortunate families on its own merits and not with reference to any other issue which would be entirely irrelevant to the consideration of a small act of mercy and consideration."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"I want to show the
4 p.m. inseparable connexion between this motion and the orders of the Government on the Knapp Committee's report. We know that the families of the Mappilla prisoners who died owing to the train tragedy ought to be compensated because it is admitted now that it took place on account of the negligence of some official or other. If the report of the Committee says that a certain set of persons is really responsible for the incident and if these persons are not properly mulcted with due punishment, this House has a right to judge whether the Government Order has properly been passed or not. If this House were to approve the order of the Government it would be perfectly justified in accepting this demand. If the order of the Government is not in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the House, it would be perfectly justified in rejecting this demand. I, therefore, submit that this demand is premature."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before the House proceeds further, it would probably be advantageous if I say just a word or two in continuation of what I have already said when the hon. the Finance Member rose to a point of order. Mr. Krishna Rao is perfectly entitled to move a motion like this, i.e., to reduce the amount of Rs. 21,000 by Rs. 100 and by so doing to enter his protest against the delay on the part of the Government in not publishing the report. I have of course nothing to say on the question whether the protest is right or wrong, or whether the Government were justified in bringing forward this demand or not. Now that the protest has been entered, and in view of the fact that no hon. Member really proposes to reduce the allotment and time presses, it is a matter for the consideration of the hon. Member Mr. Krishna Rao and other hon. Members who act with him, whether he may not withdraw the specific proposal, i.e., to reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,000 which is the only issue before the House."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"We have had a discussion as to the circumstances under which the report was not published and I did raise my protest about the delay in the matter of publication of the orders of the Government; and although the hon. the Home Member promised us that he would be able to have the matter disposed of in the course of a week —"

[27th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I did not promise, Sir. My words were 'I hope to have the matter disposed of at the end of this week'."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"Though the hon. the Home Member hoped that the orders would be issued in the course of the week, still owing to incidents which subsequently passed it was not possible for him to prepare that report, the two incidents referred to being His Excellency's absence at Delhi for some time, and also that of the hon. the Ministers at the end of last month. It will be remembered that the hon. the Minister returned from Delhi on the 4th March and that, as the matter was of an urgent character, it should have been possible for the hon. the Home Member to dispose of that matter.

"The other point which I wish to state is that nobody need be under any misapprehension as to whether there is any connexion between this motion and the publication of the report. I say there is inseparable connexion because much will depend upon the findings of the Committee. Now that we are called upon to vote for the payment of money out of the provincial funds if it is found that some particular persons are responsible for the train tragedy, it is a matter for consideration whether those persons should not be called upon to pay fines for their mistakes or be dismissed from their services. Because these Mappilla prisoners died as the result of mistakes committed by some persons, are we to vote pensions from the provincial funds, if the result of the inquiry has shown that there were some persons who were found really responsible for this incident and who can be justly called upon to pay compensation for the death of the prisoners? If that is the view to be taken, opinions would be entirely different. Now, knowing all those circumstances, we are called upon to vote funds from the provincial revenues. That is why I say there is inseparable connexion between the two incidents. I hope that no further time will be lost in the publication of this report. Notwithstanding the delay that has been caused, I do not think the hon. the Home Member, so far as I can judge, has been in a position to give us any reason to ignore the long delay in the publication of the orders of the Government, and if the Government will give us an assurance that they will publish the report without any further loss of time, I think the House will be justified in passing this grant.

"I do not want to deprive these unfortunate families of this small pittance being given to them, and while I am prepared to vote for a larger sum which might be necessary to relieve them from their sufferings, I do not think it necessary to press this motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Mr. Ramachandra Rao has complained that in all constitutional assemblies facilities are given for the discussion of matters in regard to which a large section of the assembly is at variance with the Government of the day. I quite agree with him and I am quite ready at the proper time to give full opportunity to discuss the decision at which the Government may arrive in regard to this matter. I regret as much as he does that it has not been possible for the decision to be arrived at and to be published before the adjournment which will be taking place to-day. But I never gave the least indication that there was any intention on the part of Government to permit anything in the nature of a discussion of the merits of the case before the report was published and before the Government themselves had arrived at their conclusions. Any such discussion of

27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

questions of personal responsibility would be entirely out of place in a tribunal such as this. It is quite another matter to discuss and attack the decision at which Government may arrive, apportioning blame here and exonerating from blame there. It is for that sort of discussion alone that the Government will be ready to give facilities. They are not ready to allow a report of this description to be thrown open to the world and discussed by the newspaper press, on the platform and in this Council, before they themselves have arrived at a decision. Any such course would be grossly unfair to the officers whose conduct has been impugned.

"I remain entirely unconvinced as to the supposed inseparable connexion between the question of compensation for the families of these unfortunate Mappilla prisoners and the decision that we may pass on the report as to the cause of the train tragedy and the responsibility for it, notwithstanding the ingenious arguments which have been advanced by the hon. Mover Mr. Krishna Rao, whose suggestion, as I understand, is that it might be possible to allocate the cost of this compensation to the officers who may be responsible or perhaps to the railway company. I am by no means convinced, Sir, even if that ingenious explanation were accepted, that it would not still be necessary to enter this amount on the debit side of our budget."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Demand XLV was then put to the vote and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLVI—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I have the honour to move for a grant not exceeding 0.58 lakh. There was allotment for the purchase of additional transport animals in the current year, but owing to the postponement of the Sonepur fair it was not possible to expend it during the year. Consequently it has lapsed and the Agent has asked for a similar allotment for next year. It is merely the sum required to bring the staff of transport animals up to the standard scale. There is also another item which relates to the establishment of two temporary dispensaries at Lammasinghi and Anantagiri which are required for the purpose of securing sufficient medical relief for the large number of coolies who are employed on important public works in those malarious localities. We must provide some measure of medical relief for them."

Demand XLVI was put to vote and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XXVI. CIVIL WORKS (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—"Sir, I move for a reduction under grant 'XXVI. Civil Works—Transferred' not exceeding 0.34 lakh. The motion has been necessitated owing to an error in the entries in the budget. Two entries amounting in all to .34 of a lakh have been made under head 'Demand XXVI.' In order to correct the mistake I make this motion."

The motion was put and carried and the reduction was made.

DEMAND XLVII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 10,300 under 'Demand XLVII. General Administration.'

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[27th March 1922]

The House reduced the demand for Publicity Bureau by Rs. 20,000 and in doing so they expressed the desire that we should reduce the pay of the Publicity Officer. We have arranged to do that, but in order to do so we have to provide for a voted amount in lieu of the non-voted amount of Rs. 24,600 which we shall omit. There is one small error however in the note on the agenda paper. We cannot omit the whole. We must retain one-twelfth of it because we have to pay salary for the month of March."

Demand XLVII was put to the vote and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND XLIX—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
 "Sir, I beg to move for a small demand amounting to Rs. 2,060. This is necessitated on account of the three motions in regard to the Land Revenue Department having been accepted by the Council on the 17th of this month. One of them related to the abolition of the post of one of the assistant directors in the Central Survey office, the other related to the abolition of presidency allowances granted to the officers employed in Madras and the third related to the abolition of duty allowances to the Indian special and assistant settlement officers. While giving effect to the resolutions of the Council it is necessary all the same to pay the salary and allowances respectively of these officials for the month of March and that could not be done without a vote of the House."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND L—FOREST.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 200. This amount is required under similar circumstances in order to pay the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests for the month of March 1922."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LI—REGISTRATION.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I beg to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding Rs. 225. This sum is required also for similar reasons. The Council passed motions Nos. 306 and 314, that is, motions relating to the abolition of the post of Inspector of Registration Offices as well as the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration. Their pay for the month of March has to be paid and this necessitates an allotment of Rs. 225."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LII—CIVIL JUSTICE.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 900. This is a similar motion for the allowances payable to Provincial Service officers who are now acting as District Judges."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

27th March 1922]

DEMAND LIII—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,695, which represents the pay for the month of March of the special police employed at Kamudi, but I think it right to say that the disbanding of that force is a matter on which an immediate decision is quite out of the question. It will be necessary to consult the local officers as to whether this is feasible, but what the Government ask now is provision for one month. I do not wish in any way to obscure the fact that I have no intention of sending out early orders for the disbandment of that force."

The demand was put and carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND LIV—AGRICULTURE.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" I beg to move, Sir, for a grant not exceeding Rs. 200 for a purpose similar to that already mentioned. The House will remember that hon. Members were pleased to cut down the duty allowance of the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture and of the statistical assistant. The pay of these officers is allowed to remain, but their duty allowances are taken away. Since their pay for the month of March has to be drawn (with duty allowance), since this budget is to come into force on the 1st April, and since there is no provision for it in the budget, this allotment has become necessary."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LV—LABOUR AND ALLIED DEPARTMENTS.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 5,000. This amount is a consequential grant because, when we are discharging these four assistants, we have to pay them their duty allowance for the month of March. Besides, we are making provision for an office manager as we have cut out the personal assistant."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVI—POLICE.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 16,000. I mentioned a little while ago, in connexion with a resolution under discussion earlier in the day, the reason why the Government desire to have a certain number of 'Ford' vans in order to increase the mobility and efficiency of the reserve police in the districts. Four such vans are deemed necessary in the first instance and their cost will be Rs. 16,000."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVII—AGENCY.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding 51 lakh for the Agency. This at least should not excite any controversy, for it merely represents arrears of Agency allowances due to subordinate officers in the Agency tracts at rates which have been approved by the Finance Department and formally accepted by the Finance Committee."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

DEMAND LVIII—CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (TRANSFERRED).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 1,750. This allotment is found necessary also in consequence of a resolution passed by the House abolishing the post of the personal

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[27th March 1922]

assistant to the sanitary engineer. The pay of this officer is to be paid for the month of March, and also for a further period of three months in 1922-23 for which notice is necessary."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

IV—cont.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before proceeding to the next order of the day I may inform the House that, as a result of the ballot held at 1-30 p.m. to-day for the election of six members of the Finance Committee, the following members have been duly elected :—

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.

Dr. P. Subbarayan.

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.

Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar."

VII

SECTION 201 OF THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg to move that the following draft of the rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Act be approved :—

Draft Rule.

In exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 201 (1) of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government, with the approval by resolution of the Legislative Council, make the following rule altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of that said Act :—

In rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, as amended by notifications No. 918, published on page 505 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 6th September 1921, and No. 78, published on page 44 of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 24th January 1922, for the words 'twelve months' occurring in the first line, the words 'fifteen months' be substituted.

"Sir, I have already moved resolutions for the extension of the statutory period. I have explained the reasons for asking for extension. Similar reasons hold good in the present case."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu seconded the motion.

The resolution was put and carried.

VIII

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1921-22.

Grant I—Land Revenue.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I beg to move for a supplementary grant to the extent of Rs. 33.40 lakhs under the head 'Land Revenue'. I would first wish to make it sufficiently clear that this does not in the least indicate that excess

27th March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

expenditure during the current year has been incurred to the extent of Rs. 33.40 lakhs under Land Revenue. A sum of Rs. 29,34,283 out of this amount represents a mere book adjustment. Hon. Members may be aware that until the year 1920-21, three-tenths of the expenditure that was incurred by the Land Revenue Department was debitable against Law and Justice. But since 1921-22 a new classification of accounts has been introduced. Even though the establishment may be employed for more purposes than one, their pay ought to be debited to that particular minor grant in the cadre of which they are borne, and inasmuch as the divisional officers and others who discharge magisterial functions are shown in the Land Revenue budget, the entire expenditure should appear in that budget only. Similarly, we eliminate a corresponding sum of Rs. 29,34,283 from the head of Administration of Justice where it would otherwise have found a place and transfer it to Land Revenue. It is merely a plus and minus entry causing no extra expenditure at all.

"Then, Sir, there are a few other items where there has been extra expenditure to the extent of Rs. 3.88 lakhs. This is an unavoidable expenditure; the increase under the head of salary of the deputy collector is due wholly to the arrears of pay having been paid to him in the year 1921-22 as the same was very kindly sanctioned by the House on the strong plea that I had to put forward on their behalf at the time of the last budget. Another cause is the revision of the salaries of establishments of the treasury deputy collectors due to the fixation by Government of the minimum pay of a clerk at Rs. 35 instead of Rs. 30 as before. Then under general establishments, Collectors' establishments, and subdivisional establishments, and other establishments, there is likewise an increase on account of the pay of the subordinates having been raised from Rs. 30 to Rs. 35. These are the reasons, Sir, for the increase."

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

(1) *To omit Rs. 1,300, the excess required under 22-C (b) General Administration, Secretariat and headquarter establishment—Board of Revenue.*

(2) *To reduce the sum of Rs. 33,22,953 required under 22-E. General Administration, Commissioners and District officers, by Rs. 14,400.*

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
"I also move, Sir, that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 600 under the head XVI. Interest. This is a very simple item, and is required for the purpose of refund of excess collections of interest from parties to whom loans were given. Until now this amount was regarded as non-votable, but now it is regarded as votable."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant III—Stamps.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—
"Sir, I beg to apply for a grant of Rs. 2.46 lakhs under Stamps. This is due to the fact that the contractor who supplies stamp papers to us from England has been allowed a higher rate than was entered in the original agreement on account of certain circumstances entirely beyond his control

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [27th March 1922]

The High Commissioner in London, through whom we secure our stock of stamp papers, has certified that he has satisfied himself about the reasons which justified the demand of the contractor for an enhanced rate and that he has also paid the excess amount. The Government of India have now asked us to bear our proportionate share of the extra payment that has been made to the contractor. We have accordingly calculated the amount that we have to pay on that account. Until the year 1920-21 our share was only an exact moiety of the total expenditure inasmuch as Stamps was until then a divided head. From 1921-22 it is no longer a divided head, and we have therefore to pay the full expenditure for 1921-22. All this amounts to Rs. 2·46 lakhs, and I would ask the House to vote that sum."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant V—Registration.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant of Rs. 3,000 for the excess expenditure over the budget grant under 'Transferred—9. Registration.' Last year no provision was made in the budget in connexion with extra expenditure for polling and census duties, to the officers who were conducting the polling. Provision has therefore to be made now."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant VII—General Administration.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 11,540 under '22. General Administration—Executive Council and Ministers—Provincial—Reserved.' The particular items are Excess Service Postage and Telegram charges due to the Mappilla rebellion and the general political situation in the Presidency, contingencies which include the payments made in 1921 for two bills for news agency telegrams supplied during 1920 and travelling allowances due to the extensive and most valuable touring of the hon. the Ministers."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I move for the grant of Rs. 8,751 under '22. General Administration—Provincial—Reserved' on account of tour expenses. This amount represents the difference between the actual allotment, including additions to the original budget estimate which has been duly sanctioned, and the revised figure supplied by the Accountant-General on the basis of nine months' actuals. I believe the figures have been placed before the Finance Committee."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant VIII—General Administration.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I move for an additional grant of Rs. 20,000 for the travelling allowance of non-official members of the Legislative Council. The original estimate was Rs. 1,20,000, and they have now absorbed nearly Rs. 1,60,000. This additional grant also includes the payments to non-official members who went to Delhi to induce the Government of India to reduce the contributions. We do not expect the Government of India even to pay the travelling expenses."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

27th March 1922]

Grant XII—Jails and Convict Settlements.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I move for an additional sum of Rs. 24,500 for meeting the excess expenditure anticipated under the head ‘25. Jails and Convict Settlements.’ This extra amount is required after making the necessary reappropriation owing to the influx of Mappilla prisoners into our jails.”

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XIII—Police.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I move for the grant of an additional sum of 8.53 lakhs under ‘XXVI. Police.’ This is made up of a variety of items, and I do not think the House will desire me to go into the various details which I understood have been placed before the Finance Committee. I propose to mention only two or three. Under ‘Presidency Police’ there is an item of Rs. 65,000 which was mainly spent on the employment of additional police in connexion with the labour troubles. Under ‘Salaries and establishments’ we had to meet the introduction of the revised scale of pay for deputy superintendents of police including a large arrear sum. Under ‘Police force’ an amount of 3.73 lakhs represents a series of additions sanctioned during the year for which there was no budget provision. We had to provide *inter alia* for additional police in Guntūr consisting of 20 head constables and 200 constables, for the special police force in Kamudi consisting of five head constables and 51 constables and an Inspector from the 30th of September 1921. There is also a sum of 2.10 lakhs for travelling allowance, which is due to the increased rates of travelling allowance and also to the general rise in railway fares. There is finally an amount of 3 lakhs and odd which represents the Mappilla rebellion charges. Altogether the items of charge make up a total of 11.80 lakhs, and there are savings to the extent of 3.27 lakhs on the other side to be set off, resulting in a net increase on the revised estimate of 8.53 lakhs.”

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XIV—Scientific Departments—Donations to Scientific Societies.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I move, Sir, for the grant of a sum of Rs. 2,600 under ‘XXX-B—Scientific Departments—Provincial—Museums—Transferred’ for expenditure on account of the revision of the scales of pay of the establishment in the Government Museum. The scales have been recently revised and hence the deficit, and we have to meet it.”

The demand was put and the grant was made.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, I move for a grant of Rs. 1,000 under XXX-C—Scientific Departments—Donations to Scientific Societies (Transferred) for grant to the Bandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, for the preparation of a scientific and critical edition of the Mahabharata. A similar grant was made for the year 1921-22, and this is for the year 1922-23.”

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XVII—Medical.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMAAYANINGAR :—“I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 3,68,457 for meeting the excess

[Mr. P. Ramarayaningar]

[27th March 1922]

expenditure anticipated under the head '32. Medical—Voted Charges.' Sir, in adjustment of the accounts of the current year, the deficit has been anticipated as certified by the Accountant-General."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXII—Cinchona.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Sir, I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 10.64 lakhs under 'Cinchona.' This is a large sum but has to be paid for goods supplied by the Government of India. They sent us a supply of 31,350 lb. of quinine, when, most unfortunately, the Government Cinchona Factory at Naduvattam was burnt down. We have now to meet the payment due to the Government of India for that supply."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXVI—Contribution to Local Funds.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 2,684 under '47-C. Contribution to Local Funds.'"

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXIX—Superannuation Allowances and Pension.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I move for a sum of Rs. 61,648 under '45. Superannuation Allowances and Pension—Provincial—Voted Charges.' The bulk of this amount is due to the introduction of a more liberal policy in the matter of commutation of pensions. There are other minor items under 'Gratuities', the amount of which exceeded our estimates."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXI—Stationery and Printing (Transferred).

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—" I move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,04,600 under '46. Stationery and Printing (Transferred)—Provincial—Voted Charges'. For similar reasons given by the hon. the Finance Member, I move for the grant of this amount."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXII—Miscellaneous.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I move for a sum of Rs. 100 under '47. Miscellaneous—Provincial (Reserved)' on account of travelling allowance of official and non-officials attending darbars. Sir, with the combined assistance of the Chief Secretariat and the Finance Department, I have not been able to find out exactly how this large deficit of Rs. 100 was occasioned. All that I can say is when a bill of ours was sent up to the Government of India they struck out this Rs. 100 and ordered us to pay the amount from Provincial funds.

"The next item is for a grant of Rs. 25,200 under the head '47. Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous and unforeseen charges.' This amount has to be paid as compensation to public servants who have lost their property during the rebellion in Malabar. The House may remember the instance of Mr. Chandy whose claim alone amounts to many thousands,

27th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

"The third item is for a grant of Rs. 14,240 under '47. Miscellaneous for expenses in connexion with the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.'"

The three items were put to the House and granted.

Grant XXXIII—Miscellaneous.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,000 for the excess expenditure under the budget grant under '27. Miscellaneous—Rewards for proficiency in Oriental languages.' This expenditure is mainly due to the scheme of the Government of India which allows ladies of the families of officers in the I.C.S., Medical and other services to appear for a test in the vernacular and gives Rs. 100 to each when they pass. A large number of ladies having appeared and passed, we have had to incur an additional expenditure of Rs. 1,000.

"I also move that the Government be granted the following additional sums for excess expenditure over the grants under 'Miscellaneous':—

(1) Rupees 2,515, the excess expenditure over the grant under 47-A. Miscellaneous—Donations for charitable purposes—Langarkhanas and Indian Choultries.

(2) Rupees 4,900, the excess expenditure over the grant under 47-A. Miscellaneous—Donations—Donations for charitable purposes—Miscellaneous—Miscellaneous."

The demands for Rs. 1,000, Rs. 2,515 and Rs. 4,900 were put to the House and granted.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 2,808 under petty establishments and Rs. 40,000 under expenditure in England for the year 1921-22 under the major head 47. Miscellaneous. The bulk of the latter amount is due to the fact that the Secretary of State has held that the charges on account of the candidates selected in India and sent home for training in England are to be treated as voted charges."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXIII-A—Exchange.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 12,60,000 under 40. Exchange. This is asked under circumstances which are explained in the memorandum attached to the budget."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

Grant XXXIII-B—Miscellaneous—Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I beg to move that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 19,10,000 under 52. Miscellaneous—Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments. This sum represents the result of a long series of adjustments in connexion with income-tax collections and payments and charges on account of staff ranging over the past three years. It would take a considerable time to explain this item in detail, and I therefore hope that at the present late hour the Council will accept it."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[27th March 1922]

assistant to the sanitary engineer. The pay of this officer is to be paid for the month of March, and also for a further period of three months in 1922-23 for which notice is necessary."

The demand was put and the grant was made.

IV—cont.

FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before proceeding to the next order of the day I may inform the House that, as a result of the ballot held at 1-30 p.m. to-day for the election of six members of the Finance Committee, the following members have been duly elected :—

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.

Dr. P. Subbarayan.

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.

Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.

Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar."

VII

SECTION 201 OF THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT.

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR :—" Sir, I beg to move that the following draft of the rule proposed to be made by the Local Government under section 201 of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Act be approved :—

Draft Rule.

In exercise of the powers conferred on them by section 201 (1) of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, the Local Government, with the approval by resolution of the Legislative Council, make the following rule altering rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of that said Act :—

In rule 15 (1) of Schedule X of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, as amended by notifications No. 918, published on page 505 of Part I-A of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 6th September 1921, and No. 78, published on page 44 of the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 24th January 1922, for the words 'twelve months' occurring in the first line, the words 'fifteen months' be substituted.

"Sir, I have already moved resolutions for the extension of the statutory period. I have explained the reasons for asking for extension. Similar reasons hold good in the present case."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu seconded the motion.

The resolution was put and carried.

VIII

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1921-22.

Grant I—Land Revenue.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, I beg to move for a supplementary grant to the extent of Rs. 33.40 lakhs under the head 'Land Revenue'. I would first wish to make it sufficiently clear that this does not in the least indicate that excess

[27th March 1922]

IX

PROROGATION OF THE COUNCIL.

His Excellency the GOVERNOR, in proroguing, addressed the Council as follows:—

“Mr. President and hon. Members of the Madras Legislative Council,—

“Before proroguing the Council, I am very glad, as head of the Government, to have this opportunity of thanking hon. Members for the assistance they have given us in the work of the administration of our Presidency during the past year, and of congratulating hon. Members warmly on the sense of responsibility they have shown in carrying out their important duties.

“I think we may all feel that the good ship ‘Reforms’ has fairly successfully completed her maiden voyage, and though I think we have discovered already that certain alterations in her structure require to be made in order that she may prove to be a more sea-worthy vessel, still the skipper can very truly say that he would have found the difficulties of navigation much greater if it had not been for the loyal and devoted work of the whole of the crew.

“It has been a matter of much regret to the Government that we have been unable to carry out the full programme of legislation that I outlined when I addressed hon. Members at the beginning of the session, but our time has been much occupied by the various disturbing influences of which hon. Members are well aware, and it has been found quite impossible to undertake all the rather comprehensive programme which I then hoped we might complete. I trust, however, that the coming year may be productive of peace and good-will among all communities in all parts of the Presidency, and that Government may be able next session to bring forward important measures of legislation which will help towards the better administration of our province.

“It is hardly necessary for me to refer to the serious nature of the financial situation, for hon. Members have probably, during the past month while the budget has been under discussion, had this matter constantly before their mind, but I wish generally to express my keen satisfaction at the manner in which hon. Members have exercised their powers in regard to the various proposals which have been laid before them, and assure them that Government will abide by the decisions which have been arrived at by the votes of the majority of the Council (cheers). There are one or two points, however, which I should like to refer to which have come to my notice during the budget debate. I observe that hon. Members have decided on a reduction in the amount proposed for expenditure on the Publicity department. I only refer to this matter in order to say that if the reason for that reduction lies in the fact that hon. Members intend to do much more publicity and propaganda work themselves among their constituents (laughter) during the recess which I much hope and have often urged, then there is every justification in the action which they have taken on this head.

“But another matter is one which is to my mind of such far-reaching importance if it is allowed to develop that I venture to deal with it fully and make certain suggestion to hon. Members which I am sure they will

27th March 1922] [His Excellency the Governor]

accept as given by me in the best interests of the working of the Council itself and of that intelligent control over the Government in financial matters which the Council is expected to exercise.

"Under the Instrument of Instructions there is laid upon the Governor the following duty, viz., 'to ensure the probity of public finance and the solvency of the Presidency.' There is, I need hardly say, no question of the probity of the financial administration, but the solvency of the Presidency is one as regards which I and my Government have had many searchings of heart. I need not recapitulate the financial history of the last few years. We started with great expectations, based upon what appeared to be the firmest of foundations, and with the full approval of the Council of the day proceeded at the close of the war to try to make up leeway with the aid of the balances that had been accumulated during the war. Not only, however, have we lost our expected increase, we have lost in addition a very large part of the revenue which we thought was already ours; and we have had to ask the Council to assent to taxes to meet the deficit. Hon. Members have passed some of these and while they have rejected others, they have still insisted upon the incurring of the expenditure which they were designed to meet. I do not propose in any way to interfere with the action the Council have taken, but in view of the instruction to me to safeguard the solvency of the Presidency, I feel bound to sound a note of warning.

"I know it will be replied to me that the Council's idea is that solvency should be secured by stringent economy. I do not contest that proposition. But I do ask hon. Members to realize that if they, having the power of the purse, consider that that is the only way by which to attain solvency then it is for them to put forward and carry the measures necessary to that end. I lay stress on this point, because, although as many as 794 resolutions have been moved on the budget, most of them dealing with points of detail, I have noticed that there has been a general tendency to withdraw these resolutions after discussion, but to press and carry only a small number which involve lump deductions from total grants. Now, I venture to say to the Council that this is not a correct procedure. It has been suggested that it is a desirable one because it gives the Government discretion to make such reductions as they think fit, and I know it may be argued that this is a principle which has been adopted in other Legislative Assemblies in India. As the head of the Government, I must say that I cannot accept either of these arguments. We have carefully examined the budget and put forward what appeared to us to be the minimum demands necessary for carrying on the administration. It is open to the Council in the exercise of their responsibility and their power of the purse, if they consider any details of these demands excessive, to reduce them or cut them out, but I do not think that it is proper to ask the Government, who regard the whole as essential, to choose which of the essentials they will do without.

"I think hon. Members will agree that the object of budget discussion is to give the opportunity to any member of moving to reduce or cut out individual items under any head of the budget and take the responsibility for it himself. The danger of these omnibus reductions is that, if the system is permitted to develop, they would cause the budget discussion to deteriorate into a scramble for lump sum deductions; that the Government

[His Excellency the Governor] [27th March 1922]

would be tempted to ask for more than what they need so as to meet the contingency of omnibus reductions, and that the interest in and the educative value of budget discussion would suffer and the consequences would be more far-reaching than is probably now realized.

"I have expressed myself fully and freely to hon. Members on this matter and am sure they will accept such advice as I have ventured to give in the spirit in which it is given as coming from one who is eager and anxious as I have already said, for the best interests of the future working of our Council. (Applause.)

"The reasons for our large deficit are, as hon. Members are aware, mainly three in number. In the first place, the very great cost of the increase in salaries particularly among the more low-paid officials owing to the general increase in prices during the past few years; in the second place the loss of revenue that has occurred owing to the violent activities of the non-co-operation propaganda and in the third place the payment of Rs. 3½ crores to the Central Government under the arrangement which has been forced on us notwithstanding our strongest protests as a result of the report of Lord Meston's Financial Relations Committee. The effect of this adverse financial position has necessarily been the postponement of many projects which would be of great advantage to the people, a practical stoppage of much necessary development in all departments. I need hardly say that this has been most disappointing not only to myself and to every member of my Government but to departmental officers as well, and very especially to my hon. Colleagues, the Ministers, who are in charge of most of the developing departments, and to whom it has been a very great blow that in the first year of the life of the Reforms scheme they who control the transferred departments have been unable to start many schemes which I know well they are eager and anxious to develop. I trust we may see an improvement in the financial situation during the coming year; hon. Members may rest assured that Government will do everything in their power to secure that desirable end.

"I must refer, having regard to recent happenings, to the position of Government in regard to the non-co-operation movement.

5 p.m.

I can assure hon. Members that Government have no desire to take drastic action against any one, but law and order must be maintained, in order that the law-abiding citizen may feel safe and secure in carrying on his ordinary avocations. I wish, however, to point out how extraordinarily difficult is the position of Government in a matter of this sort. It really seems to be this. If any dangerous outbreak occurs owing to the activities of any revolutionary agitators, Government are taken severely to task for not having taken strong action to prevent it; but if that strong action is taken, they are told that the moment for such action is inopportune and that it will have disastrous consequences. The difficulty of our position is very much evidenced at the present time. I think that the firm action which Government has taken with regard to civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes has been generally approved; but when the prime-mover and leader of that policy is arrested, action which I consider to have been amply justified and which Mr. Gandhi appears to think fully justified himself, it appears from what I read in the press that in several quarters the arrest is considered most impolitic and undesirable. I can but say that it is impossible

27th March 1922] [His Excellency the Governor]

for Government to be on both sides of the fence at the same moment. We believe that law and order must be firmly maintained, we are acting up to that belief and expect to receive the support of all law-abiding and peace-loving citizens in our efforts to take a straightforward course to that end. And we are also firmly of the opinion that, while the revolutionary agitation of non-co-operators with all its resultant destruction of property and bloodshed, while their persistent and ill-mannered efforts to minimise the good effects of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, have created an unfortunate impression as to the state of India in the minds of my countrymen in England, the vast majority of the people of India are true and loyal to the British Throne, and we are clear that these unfortunate incidents should not deter us from pressing forward towards the achievement of India's ambition, absolutely equal partnership in the commonwealth of nations that make up the great British Empire. (Cheers.)

"But this ambition, I am convinced, will never be achieved unless we are all determined to work together in a spirit of loyal co-operation and goodwill, and with this in my mind may I ask the Council to exercise forbearance in the discussion of questions relating to the services, both English and Indian, whether inside this House or out of it? I am sure hon. Members do not bear the services any ill-will, in fact, that there exist the best of feelings between many members of this Council and members of the services with whom they have come into contact. But I do ask them to consider what may be the effect in small stations in the mufassal of brief, and perhaps not too accurate, reports of statements made in controversy here which all of us who hear them understand. Members of the services have had much to unsettle them in changes in the system of control in the prospect of further change in the policy in which they were brought up in the absence of personal knowledge of their new masters and in numerous other ways. They are in certain quarters the subject of constant aspersion and attack, some of which may be justified if directed to the system, but which is quite unfair when applied to individuals, and above all their future is very uncertain. The Council need in this present year of stress the very best work they can secure from the trained officers, and I ask them to recognize that the best class of work will not be secured from men who are harassed by criticism, who feel that their efforts are not appreciated and who feel keenly this uncertainty as to their future. Believe me, I know what I am saying when I tell hon. Members that the European officers who are staying in India under the new constitution are out to help, that they are willing to give of their best in the future as they have done in the past, and having accepted the new order of things they are only too anxious to see the new machine running smoothly. I appeal to all therefore to be generous in their judgments of officers of Government to believe the best and not the worst, to look upon officials as friends and not enemies, and they on their part I know will be only too ready to respond in that spirit of goodwill and friendship for which I am now appealing.

"Before I conclude, I wish to refer to the departure to England of two of our highest officers of the Council, I refer to the President and to the Leader of the House, Sir Lionel Davidson. The departure of the former is, I am glad to say, only for a period of a few months, and he is going, accompanied by his Legislative Council Secretary, to gain knowledge at first hand of the procedure and methods of the Houses of Parliament. I am sure we all wish

[His Excellency the Governor] [27th March 1922]

them a safe journey, and trust that they will return to us full of useful information which will increase the efficiency of the working of our Council. Sir Lionel Davidson is leaving us at the end of a service career extending over thirty-two years which he has devoted to the best interests of the administration of this Presidency. From his wide knowledge of the affairs of this Presidency and from his transparent sincerity and straight forwardness in all his actions (cheers), I can very truly say that I shall much miss his counsel and advice. I am sure every hon. Member would wish to join me in expressing our gratitude to him for his long and faithful service to our Presidency, and our hope that he may enjoy a well-earned rest from his labours and maintain his interest in the well-being of the people of this country among whom he has spent so many years of his life. (Cheers.)

"I hereby declare this Council prorogued and trust that hon. Members may enjoy rest and relaxation and return full of Vigour and energy to undertake their duties for the coming year." (Applause.)

At 5-10 p.m. the Council adjourned *sine die*.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

